THEORETICAL AND DISCUSSION JOURNAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

JANUARY 1964

Marxism Today

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

BRIAN SIMON — THE CHALLENGE OF MARXISM

R. PALME DUTT — NATIONAL LIBERATION TODAY

JOHN LEWIS — MARX'S VIEW OF ALIENATION

R. F. WILLETTS — THE NECESSITY OF ART

DISCUSSION:
BERT BAKER — WHAT IS TELEVISION?

Monthly 2/-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marxism Today

Vol. 8 No. 1

CONTENTS

		page
	Editorial Comments	1
Brian SIMON	The Challenge of Marxism ...	6
R. PALME DUTT	National Liberation Today: Report to Executive Committee, November 10, 1963 ...	9
John LEWIS	Marx's View of Alienation ...	17
R. F. WILLETTS	The Necessity of Art	23
DISCUSSION: Bert BAKER	What is Television?	28

AMONG ARTICLES IN FEBRUARY AND FORTHCOMING ISSUES

Idris COX	Socialist Ideas in Africa
Dennis GOODWIN	The Shop Stewards
William LAUCHLAN	The Role of the Communist Party
Ernst FISCHER	Art and Superstructure
Michael COHEN	Thoughts on British Poetry Today
Sam AARONOVITCH	Sociology, Class and Power
Martin MILLIGAN	Marxism and Ethics
E. FROW & H. HIKINS	The Liverpool Transport Strike of 1911

Editor James Klugmann

Editorial Board

Professor J. D. Bernal
Emile Burns
Gabriel Carritt
Maurice Cornforth
Maurice Dobb
John Gollan
Jack Hendy
Arnold Kettle
John Lewis
Frank McKenna
John Mahon
Alan Morton
Professor George Thomson
Charles Watkins

Editorial Correspondence
James Klugmann
16 King Street, W.C.2

Advertisements
Doris Allison,
above address

Orders and Subscriptions
usual agents or
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Gray's Inn Road,
London, W.C.1

Subscription rates
Six issues 13s. 6d.
Twelve issues 27s.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Editorial Comments

THE Americans are exploiting Britain, just as British imperialism, past and present has been exploiting its colonies and dominions, so says *The Economist.*

It is not as if that worthy periodical uses the word exploitation. It does specifically complain, however, that the Americans seem to be getting a much better return on their investments in Britain than British imperialism is getting in America or generally abroad.

Nevertheless, a quite formidable sum is received in the form of property income (mainly interest, profits and dividends) from abroad. Standing at £1,182 million for the year 1962 it is 24 per cent higher than in the year 1957. Foreign taxes paid abroad amounted in 1962 to £417 million (though not all of them are deductions from this property income). Still even allowing all taxation to have been deducted from this property income, it would leave a tidy net income of around £780 million a year.

From the sterling area, the total amount of interest profit and dividends was £432 million, and the non-sterling area which includes Canada £348 million. British imperialism is still squeezing out formidable amounts from its Dominions old and new.

But others are now beginning to squeeze formidable amounts out of British capitalism. £455 million was paid in interest, profits and dividends to foreign companies and investors in 1962.

Shipping Disaster

In 1938 (just before the Second World War) British imperialism was receiving in income from property abroad the sum of £247 million. It was paying out £43 million to foreigners who were investing in this country. By 1962 in interest, profits and dividends (after deduction of foreign taxes) it was receiving £780 million, or three times the sum of 1938. It was now, however, paying out to foreigners (after deduction of taxes) the sum of £455 million—more than 10 times the amount paid out in 1938.

Probably the most remarkable reversal is that of income from shipping. In 1932 the United Kingdom sold shipping services valued at £559 million to foreigners and bought from foreigners shipping services to the value of £425 million. The capitalist economy of the U.K. had therefore a surplus of £134 million on its shipping transactions. Since 1960, however, the position has been reversed. Britain is buying more shipping services from foreigners than it is selling.

In 1962, it bought £690 million of shipping services from foreigners and sold them £645 million. It had, therefore, a deficit of £45 million. This would have appeared utterly incredible to any previous generation of British capitalists. Indeed it would have been regarded as almost incredible even five years ago.

Cost of Militarism

The other almost incredible thing (not mentioned by *The Economist*) about Britain's relation to the outside world is the growth of the British Government's Overseas Expenditure. It was as low as £54 million in 1952, when the Germans were paying for the full upkeep of the British Army in Germany and the United States was giving a certain amount of military aid. It has now risen to £367 million of which £246 million is for the upkeep of the British forces abroad. The costs are still going up steadily year after year.

The moral is that, contrary to popular belief, British exports are now more than sufficient to pay for all the imports required for the British capitalist economy.

It is because of the overseas military expenditure of £246 million per annum and the annual investment abroad of £250-£300 million, that the British capitalist economy is being run on a shoestring, with reserves so meagre that it cannot meet even a small recession, without screaming for assistance from the International Monetary Fund or the European bankers.

Foreign Capital in U.K.

Which capitalist groups own the £1,400 million which foreigners have invested in Britain?

The United States capitalists have invested directly £984 million in Britain. (This takes no account of the shares that American capitalists may hold in British companies.) The next largest foreign investor is Canada with £130 million

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(some of this may be American capital subscribed by Canadian companies whose shares are controlled by Americans) and the third is Switzerland with £86 million.

American companies located in Britain drew an income of 10.1 per cent on their assets in 1962. British companies in America drew only 7.3 per cent. Canadian companies in Britain drew 6.1 per cent as compared with British companies in Canada drawing only 3 per cent. The Dutch companies operating in Britain drew 10.1 per cent on assets as compared with the 9.2 per cent drawn by British companies in Holland.

Foreign private capitalist investment in Britain is growing faster than British private investment abroad. In 1952 U.K. capitalists invested £127 million abroad, while foreign capitalists invested £13 million in the U.K. By 1961 British capitalists were investing £326 million abroad but foreign capitalists invested £417 million in Britain. 1962 confirms this picture. British capitalism invested £259 million abroad but foreign capitalists invested £274 million in Britain.

This is not the whole picture for it leaves out British investments abroad in oil, insurance and banking. Nevertheless, British capitalists before world war two would have found the remarkable growth of foreign capitalist investments in Britain uncanny and alarming.

Lenin's Collected Works

Two more volumes have now appeared in the English edition of Lenin's *Collected Works*.[1] Seventeen are now, therefore, available of the total 40-volume edition.

Both these new volumes, which together cover all Lenin's writings and speeches for the period September 1909 - April 1912, are devoted in the main to the struggle for the Party, to the fight against all sorts of right-wing and leftist trends like liquidationism, "otzovism", anarchism, Trotskyism, etc.

For those especially interested in Lenin's view of the British Labour movement there are two valuable articles. One, *Conference of the British Social-Democratic Party,* deals with the 1911, Coventry, Conference of the S.D.P., and in particular with the fight within the Party against Hyndman's militarist outlook. The second, of the same year, is a review of Hyndman's *Record of an Adventurous Life.*

For those who have not the possibility, for the moment, of studying the whole contents, I would recommend especially two short articles that treat of trends in the international Socialist movement during this period—both of them written in December 1910.

The first—*Differences in the European Labour Movement* (Vol. 16, pp. 347-352)—shows how Lenin was occupied in fighting distortions of Marxism of *both* a right-wing and leftist character:

> "The principal tactical differences in the present-day labour movement of Europe and America reduce themselves to a struggle against two big trends that are departing from Marxism. . . . These two trends are revisionism (opportunism, reformism) and anarchism (anarcho-syndicalism, anarcho-socialism)."

Lenin is interested not only in analysing and combating these trends but in studying their origins

The second—*Certain Features of the Historical Development of Marxism*—is devoted to a favourite theme of Lenin's, to Engels' words that Marxism is "not a dogma but a guide to action". I cannot do better than quote the opening paragraph:

> "Our doctrine," said Engels—referring to himself and his famous friend—"is not a dogma but a guide to action." This classical statement stresses with remarkable force and expressiveness that aspect of Marxism which is very often lost sight of. And by losing sight of it, we turn Marxism into something one-sided, distorted and lifeless; we deprive it of its life blood; we undermine its basic theoretical foundations—dialectics, the doctrine of historical development, all-embracing and full of contradictions; we undermine its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch, which may change with every new turn of history."

Land relations in Africa

Agriculture is the main economic activity in practically all African countries. Though there have been some important changes in the last 20 years, some important movements from village to town, the rural population still predominates, ranging from 67 per cent in the United Arab Republic (1957) to 96 per cent in Togo (1956). Only in South Africa does the urban population comprise almost half of the total population (46.6 per cent in 1951).

Of the direct producers in African agriculture peasants compose the great majority. In the majority of African countries the class differentiation within the peasantry is still small.

All African countries, therefore, that have won their political independence, face a most urgent problem of reconstructing and developing agriculture. The question of different forms of land

[1] V. I. Lenin—*Collected Works,* volumes 16 and 17. *Lawrence & Wishart,* 12s. 6d. each.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ownership, of land tenure, of land reform, are of outstanding importance, but of extreme complexity, given the intricate interdependence of the most diverse historical forms of land ownership and tenure which are characteristic of Africa.

It is interesting to be able to read an examination of this question of *Land Relations in African Countries* by a Russian expert, Professor Ivan Potekhin, Director of the African Institute of the U.S.S.R., whose article, under this title, has been reproduced in the most recent issue of *The African Communist*.[2]

The Professor shows the extraordinary complexity of the different forms of land ownership and tenure that grew up in Africa. He describes the areas (like South Africa and Southern Rhodesia) where there are great European-owned farms and plantations, the examples of state feudal land ownership (as in the Muslim emirates of Northern Nigeria), private feudal land ownership in the hands of African owners (for instance the Maghreb countries, and in Ethiopia and Uganda), forms of communal land ownership which have persisted to this day, private peasant ownership, etc.

The extreme complexity of the different forms of ownership and tenure naturally determines the diversity of the approaches to the solution of the agrarian problems, the different forms of agrarian reform.

Professor Potekhin suggests that for such countries as South Africa and Southern Rhodesia, where large European land ownership is still in force, the main line of solution will be that "the land must be distributed to those that till it".

But what, for instance, of the acres that are at present communally owned? He shows that

> "the communal system of peasant ownership need not by any means be a binding pre-condition for the Socialist way of development, but in certain circumstances the preservation of communal land ownership may facilitate the co-operation of peasant households and in that way the transition to Socialism."

The Governments of the young African states have not all yet decided their attitude on this question. But Professor Potekhin quotes Kwame Nkrumah:

> "In the vast rural areas of Africa, the people hold land in common and work it on the principle of self-help and co-operation. These are the main features still predominating in African society, and we cannot do better than bend them to the requirements of a more modern Socialistic pattern of society."

[2] *The African Communist*, No. 15, Oct.-Dec. 1963, 1s. 6d.

Shadow of Bonn

Our comrades in the German Democratic Republic have been carrying out considerable research on the neo-colonialist role of West German imperialism in the under-developed countries, particularly Africa. Bonn neo-colonialism assumes many different forms.

One of these is through the medium of the Common Market, and this is examined in detail in a recent book by Hartmut Schilling—*The Shadow of the Common Market Over Africa: On the Collective Colonialism of the Common Market*.[3]

Schilling describes the imperialist character of the Common Market policy of "association" with Africa: "collective colonialism", he calls it, taking the phrase from Kwame Nkrumah. But he also describes the contradictions of the Common Market countries within this policy, and particularly the aims of the Bonn Government.

> "The role played by West German imperialism in the system of 'collective colonialism' of the Common Market is that of the most aggressive and at the same time the economically strongest of the Common Market States, the state whose policy is most of all based on anti-communism. . . ."

He shows in a series of tables the growth of West German investments in and trade with Africa and other colonial countries. West German direct private investments in Africa rose, for instance, between December 1961 and December 1962 from 221.9 to 316.9 million marks.

For those whom the language barrier prevents from reading Hartmut Schilling's book there is some useful material in the most recent issue of *German Foreign Policy*, a journal published in the German Democratic Republic in the English language.[4] They will find a study by V. Fenzlein on *Problems of Bonn's Neo-Colonialism*, a review of a recent book by Schilling and Friedländer on *West Germany—Colonial Power*, and a detailed examination by P. Halpap of *West Germany's Technical Aid to Latin America and its Background*.

Very revealing is the examination of the role of the West German so-called "Ministry of Economic Co-operation", which is directed especially to the under-developed countries. Fenzlein quotes some interesting public statements of a certain Herr Vialon, State Secretary of this Ministry.

[3] Hartmut Schilling — *E.W.G. — Schatten über Afrika: Zum kollektiven Kolonialismus der E.W.G.* Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1963.

[4] *German Foreign Policy* No. 5, 1963. Published by Rütten & Loening, Berlin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The idea is not," wrote Vialon in the *Deutsche Zeitung* (10.7.62),

> "to impose our own social system upon the recipient. But 'change in thinking' should be demanded before aid is given. However, once given, such aid should produce a permanent change."

Frank? Still franker is the quoted broadcast of the same official on the Hesse radio:

> "We are looking for partners in African, Asian and, above all, the South American countries, whom we can help with our economic potential. We look for partners who are independent of the State, and try to find such partners in order to counteract any State economy in the newly founded States." [5]

Who Subsidises Whom?

Except for steel the Tories' anti-nationalisation propaganda is exceedingly muted as compared with that of 1959. They are clearly in a dilemma. If the nationalised industries are such total failures, as Tory propaganda normally represents them to be, why are the Tories pursuing an annual investment programme in 1963-64 of slightly over £1,000 million which will rise to £1,200 million in 1964-65?

In the *Bulletin for Industry* for November 1963, issued by the Information Department of the Treasury, it is admitted that in the past, some of the apparently poor performance of the nationalised industries was due to the fact that those industries through price policy were in fact subsidising private enterprise. We are told that "the White Paper on the Financial and Economic Obligations of the Nationalised Industries (Cmd. 1337) issued in April 1961 showed that the returns on the public capital invested in these bodies had been low compared with those achieved in private industry *implying a degree of subsidisation to consumers both personal and industrial*" (italics ours).

The Treasury certainly knows how to wrap it up in verbiage. The fact that privately owned industry was getting its goods and services too cheap from the nationalised industries, and that part of private industry's profit was being achieved at the expense of the nationalised industries is presented as "implying a degree of subsidisation to consumers both personal and industrial".

The dear old Treasury cannot admit straightforwardly the quite enormous subsidisation of private industry by the nationalised Electricity Supply industry, without shouting that the housewife's electric fire may be getting subsidised too.

However, it has to admit that quite remarkable progress is being made by the nationalised industries as follows:

> "For example, output per man-shift in the coal industry increased by nearly 8 per cent in 1962, and the average cost per ton mined has remained constant in real prices over the last five years."

Of how many privately owned industries could this be said of the particular goods that they are producing?

> "The capital cost of electric power stations has been progressively reduced from £53 per kilowatt in 1948 to £35 per kilowatt in coal-fired stations now being built for commissioning in 1965 onwards, despite increases of about 93 per cent between 1946 and 1962 in wages and materials now entering into power station construction costs.
>
> "British European Airways have cut the cost of air transport per ton mile by 75 per cent in real terms since 1947."

However, these things are only being admitted now, when the Tory government is ordering the nationalised industries to increase their charges. There is no harm in charging the monopolists more but not the domestic consumers.

The moral is that a nationalised industry can work very efficiently indeed, but that, in state monopoly capitalism, its efficiency will benefit the monopolists rather than the people.

Still it will be interesting to see if the Tories will change back to the old slanders on the eve of the election.

London Landmarks

In 1948, centenary of the publication of the *Communist Manifesto*, a small duplicated pamphlet was produced under the title of *London Landmarks*. It was prepared by two comrades—Eileen Palmer and the late Jimmy Shields, and listed the places in London associated with Marx, Engels, Lenin, and the early days of the international working-class movement.

Now a third edition has been published by the Communist Party, printed, illustrated with maps, and with much additional material. A lot of hard research has gone in to locating and identifying a number of the historic sites associated with the spread of Marxism in Britain.

Londoners can learn how Marx attended the Second Congress of the Communist League at the end of 1847 at 20 Great Windmill Street, hall of the Communist Workers' Educational Union. It was here that Marx and Engels were commissioned to write the *Communist Manifesto*, the first edition of which was printed at 46 Liverpool Street, Bishopsgate.

[5] *Bulletin des Presse - und Informationsamtes der Bundesregierung*, August 25, 1962.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

You will be able to follow the moves of the Marx family from their first lodgings in Anderson Street, Chelsea (whence they were ruthlessly evicted), to Leicester Street (adjoining Leicester Square), to Dean Street, Soho (here they lived for a period in what is now the restaurant *Quo Vadis*), to York Place, Camberwell, to Grafton Terrace Kentish Town, to Maitland Park Road, near Chalk Farm (now the site of a block of L.C.C. flats).

Lenin, too, on a number of occasions, lived in or visited London. His wife, Krupskaya, in her *Memories of Lenin*, writes of their experiences. They came first in April 1902 and set up house in 30 Holford Square, in the borough of Finsbury. In 1905 Lenin lived for a period at 16 Percy Circus in the same area. Not far away, and still standing, is the "Crown and Woolpack" public house, where Lenin and his friends used to meet, and where, it is reported, a police detective hid himself in a cupboard to eavesdrop.

So if you would like to follow up the dwelling places in London of Marx, Engels, Wilhelm Liebknecht and Lenin; if you are interested in the whereabouts of the foundation conference of the First International, of the meetings of its General Council, of the Halls where assembled the delegates of the Second, Third and Fifth Congresses of the Bolshevik Party; or, if you wish to know where in London the illegal *Iskra* was printed; then we strongly recommend this pamphlet.[6]

A Soviet Study of British Labour

Just as we were going to press we received from the Soviet Union a full-length study of *The Contemporary Working-Class Movement in Britain* by Valentin Vladimirovich Peschanski.[7]

We have not yet had the time to study this book, but we thought that readers would be interested to know the ground that it covers.

The author starts with a general introduction on the specific characteristics of the British working-class movement. He proceeds with a section on the post-war position in Britain—post-war capitalism, the social gains of the working class following the war, employment and unemployment, wages, changes in the structure of the working class.

He then examines post-war trade union developments, the growth and structural changes of the trade union movement, the organisation and role of the shop stewards. In the third chapter on *Economic Struggle* he discusses the post-war strike movement and the methods of the ruling class to combat strikes.

In the fourth and fifth chapters (*Political Organisations and the Working Class*, and *Political Struggle*), he analyses the specific character of the Labour Party, the organisation and role of the Communist Party, the work of various right-wing organisations and committees amongst the working class.

In a concluding chapter he discusses what he calls the "Crisis of Labourism".

It is always interesting to see how others see us, and it will be particularly interesting to examine this view of the British working-class movement from a young Russian research worker who has devoted a number of years to the study of the British Labour movement, and who would seem from the many sources quoted, to have covered a wide field.

Release the South African Prisoners

The Anti-Apartheid Movement (15 Endsleigh Street, W.C.1) are circulating a petition in support of the struggle against racial injustice, demanding the abandonment of political trials and the immediate release of all political prisoners in South Africa. Signatures will be sent to the Secretary General of the United Nations and all donations forwarded to the Defence and Aid Fund.

We would ask all our readers to play what part they can in this world campaign for the release of South African political prisoners.

Please post MARXISM TODAY to me every month.

I enclose (put X in the appropriate box)

☐ **13/6** for **6** months.

☐ **27s.** for one year.

(write in capital letters)

Name .....

Address .....

.....

☛ **POST WITH REMITTANCE to Central Books Ltd., 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1**

[6] *London Landmarks*: Third edition, Communist Party, 1s. 6d.

[7] V. V. Peschanski—*Sovremennoe Rabochee Dvizhenie v Anglii*. Publishing House of Social-Economic Literature, Moscow, 1963.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Challenge of Marxism

Brian Simon

THE Week of Marxist discussion and debate, "The Challenge of Marxism", held under the auspices of *Marxism Today* with the assistance of the Cultural Committee of the Communist Party, took place in London from November 14th to 22nd.

There is no doubt that the Week as a whole was a very invigorating and stimulating affair. An impressive range of subjects were under discussion, including science, philosophy, the social sciences as well as the arts (theatre, music, literature and films). The Week as a whole bore witness to the power of Marxist ideas, bringing out the specific contribution and close relevance of Marxism to the understanding of a wide variety of different fields of human thought and activity.

The fourteen subjects were introduced by leading Marxists, occasionally in discussion with non-Marxists. The Week showed that Marxists are now in a position to make authoritative, challenging statements on a large variety of topics. Tribute should also be paid to the ability of the lecturers as lecturers. The opening statements were extremely well prepared and delivered with conviction, force and wit. Many of these will be published, if sometimes in a shortened form, in succeeding numbers of *Marxism Today*.

Economics and Sociology

It is impossible for any one person to give an authoritative account of the various discussions during the Week, if only because several of these were carried on simultaneously. However, a general impression may be given of some of the topics raised at the main lectures. These were attended by audiences ranging from 130 to 180, including both Communists and non-Communists, the latter, as was evident from the nature of their contributions, profoundly interested in Marxism and anxious to discuss common problems in a positive way. Indeed a feature of the whole Week was the friendly atmosphere at the various meetings, the genuine attempt by the audiences to grasp the meaning of the lectures, and to raise problems of agreement and disagreement in order to reach clarity.

The first meeting, on "Sociology: Class and Power", drew an audience of 180. It was significant as one of the first attempts by Marxists in this country to assess the nature of academic sociology, a growing field of study in the universities. Sam Aaronovitch, in his opening lecture, outlined the Marxist approach to class and class relations, and discussed in particular tendencies among academic sociologists to separate the question of power from that of class, to put forward purely subjective criteria of class, and to elevate subsidiary elements in the social structure (for instance, education) to the role of main determinants of social change.

All these and other matters were taken up in the discussion, which ranged freely over the whole field of sociology and the Marxist interpretation of social change. A particular controversy developed over the ideas concerning "élites" of the progressive American sociologist Wright Mills, whose last book, *The Marxists*, is now available in a Penguin edition. Others criticised the Marxist "model" of social change in terms of the mode of production and social relations. The existing categories of sociologists came in for sharp criticism, being characterised as an emasculation of Marxism. All these and other points were dealt with very effectively by the speaker in his reply. It is clear that there are very many issues in this field which need to be taken further through discussion between Marxist and non-Marxist sociologists. A good deal of common ground exists, especially among that section of sociologists who recognise the importance of Marxism and are finding their way towards it. This first discussion opens the way to further, more intensive exchange of views in the future.

The second session, a discussion between Maurice Dobb and Professor J. R. Sargent (of the new University of Warwick), was on the problem of economic growth under socialism and capitalism. This revealed rather sharp differences of opinion, since unlike Dobb, Sargent held that the problems of growth under both systems were essentially similar, and that "institutional change" (that is, the transition to socialism) does not alter their character. The problems were largely technical and administrative: how to feed technical advance into the productive process; how to withhold resources from consumption for investment; and how to allocate resources to meet changing needs and the requirements of the people.

The discussion, however, tended to concentrate on the differences between the two systems: on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the meaning of socialism for the worker whose labour no longer contributes to private profit, on the effect of the distribution of wealth on what is actually produced under capitalism, and similar issues. In his reply Dobb stressed the strongly "oscillating" character of capitalism, where the so-called "stabilisers" (capital investment in public works and the nationalised industries, etc.) operate slowly, so leading to instability and the start-stop economy of the post-war period—a factor limiting the rate of economic growth. He stressed also the sustained high rate of growth of socialist as compared to capitalist countries, a point, however, which Sargent queried by reference to Japan and West Germany. In Sargent's view, the common ground between Marxist and non-Marxist economists lay in his thesis that the basic problems of growth are common to both systems, and that mutual discussion of these problems could be expanded to the benefit of both.

Arts and Sciences

Saturday, November 16th, was the fullest day of the Week, with four lectures in the morning carried on simultaneously and four in the afternoon. Many who wished to go to more than one lecture at the same time were forced to make a choice and this was often difficult, with the galaxy of speakers available. In the morning, in small halls, André van Gyseghem dealt with the factors leading to the "breakthrough" in the theatre to the modern, realistic type of drama typified in the work of Osborne, Wesker and others. Margot Heinemann lectured on "The Modern Novel", and Sam Fisher on "Marxism and Education". These lectures drew audiences of 30 to 40 and it is planned to publish them to a wider audience in the future.

At the same time Eric Hobsbawm lectured to an audience of 140 on the crucial topic "Are there laws of history?" There followed a very lively discussion which centred on the concepts of progress, historical inevitability (determinism), the role of great men and of accident in history. The whole question as to whether history is a science, and if so what kind of a science, came up for discussion as well as the related question as to whether the historian is capable of making predictions, and if so, again, what kind of predictions. In a witty and compelling reply to the discussion, Eric Hobsbawm dealt effectively and undogmatically with these and other important and indeed fundamental points. He concluded by stressing the great change that has come over historical studies over the last few years. Historians who, in general, previously rejected Marxism, are now increasingly influenced by Marxist ideas and the Marxist approach.

In the afternoon the smaller meetings were addressed by E. V. Rowsell, on "Marxism and Science", Tom Russell on "Nationality and Music", and by Lionel Munby on "Democracy viewed historically". In each of these meetings really serious and lively discussions followed the lectures. The largest meeting, drawing an audience again of some 140, was that held on "The Artist and Society" with Alan Bush and Arnold Kettle. Here again the discussion centred round the issues raised by the speakers, though focusing to some extent on Ernst Fischer's recent Penguin *The Necessity of Art*, especially on Fischer's theories concerning the role of magic in art. Only Marxism, said Kettle in his reply to the discussion, begins to give a deep and full analysis of the relation between language, thought and activity, of the part that language plays in helping us to become human. It was the job of the Marxist not only to interpret artistic activity in terms of its history and social background, but also to evaluate it. We are only at the beginning of developing a Marxist approach to literature; there are whole areas of our literary heritage where Marxists have not yet begun to unveil the full richness of our writers—Blake was a case in point. (Eric Hobsbawm made much the same point as regards historical studies.)

Kettle's rebuttal of the statement that there exists a whole corpus of "vulgar Marxist" work on literature and the arts met with a sympathetic response from the audience; the work of George Thomson, Lukacs, Alick West and many others proved the contrary. Those present, incidentally, will long remember Alan Bush's characteristic reply to the discussion, which had the whole hall rocking with laughter, on the role of art. The greatest danger to art, he said, were those who "pursue art", especially "unmarried men". These become "lovers of art". Art was an ordinary human activity. Before men can enjoy art, they must have enough to eat. The discussion at this session was carried on at a high level, and was much appreciated by the audience.

Films, Philosophy, Folk Song

On the Sunday, two sessions were arranged. In the morning Sid Cole, producer of "The Kitchen" and of the Robin Hood series on television, gave a profound analysis of the structure of the film industry, and of the problems created by its decline and by monopoly control, finishing up by dealing with trends in the content and character of British films. This was described as "a smashing talk" by Ivor Montague, another film producer,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who was present—one that gave a complete view of the problems of the film industry. But perhaps the surprise of the Week was the large turn out to Maurice Cornforth's lecture in the afternoon. The subject: "Philosophy, the Linguistic School", being somewhat abstruse, was expected to draw an audience of some 20 to 30 semi-professional philosophers. Instead some 120 packed into the room to hear a very clear statement on the roots and significance of linguistic philosophy, including an exposition of Wittgenstein's first and second theories, as well as an assessment of the value of the linguistic approach for Marxists.

Cornforth's lecture of over an hour fully held his audience, and was followed by a long and extremely lively discussion in which many of the audience participated. Marxists, Cornforth concluded, must recognise that they have not got the answers to all philosophic questions. Marxism itself is capable of development since it acts not only to remove illusions as regards non-Marxist views, but also assimilates those elements of other systems or approaches which can be shown to be true. This, he said, after completing his critical analysis of linguistic philosophy, applies to this approach as well as to other fields of learning. Cornforth's lecture will form part of a book *Marxism and Linguistic Philosophy* which will be published by Lawrence and Wishart this year.

On Sunday evening the intellectual labours of the Week were lightened by an evening of folk song entitled "The Rights of Man". A predominantly young audience crowded into the St. Pancras Town Hall to hear a programme having a directly political or human significance, very effectively compèred by A. L. Lloyd. Ninety-nine per cent of folk songs, said Peggy Seeger, are about the rights of man—the programme included songs on the St. Pancras rent strike (by Peggy Seeger), anti-war songs on the right to live free from fear of war (by the Ian Campbell group), union songs such as "The Blackleg Miner" (by Bob Davenport, who also sang the North-East version of the revolutionary song "The Cutty Wren"), as well as songs on the wages issue (by Ewan MacColl), on the Sharpeville massacre ("The Ballad of the 21st March"), together with a number of traditional Newcastle songs by Dan Reevey. This was an inspiring as well as an entertaining evening, and its general political emphasis chimed in well with the other events of the Week.

Universe and Life

Introduced by the chairman, J. R. Campbell, as "one of the world's foremost scientists and foremost fighters for peace", J. D. Bernal, on the Monday, gave an outstanding lecture on "The Universe and Life". Stressing the value of the Marxist approach, he showed how the key problem of the origin of life could only be solved through grasping the interconnection of all parts of science—particularly physics, chemistry, biochemistry and biology. Paying tribute to the work of the Soviet scientist Oparin, as well as to Haldane, in the solution of some of the most difficult problems in this field, he gave a complex but clear description of the origin of life on our planet. "It would be easier to prove that life doesn't exist than that it does," he said, "but in fact it does—and the secret of life is known," now at last seen as a process explicable by rational means. On as many as 100,000 other planets the conditions for life also exist, though in all these life may take different forms.

It was fitting that the Week should be brought near to its close by the most distinguished Marxist now working in the field of science. The final session, a discussion between George Matthews and Canon Collins on "The Roots of War and the Conditions for Peace", fell somewhat outside the main stream of the other events.

Discussion of Marxism

It is too early yet to assess the overall impact of the Week's activities. The fact that it was carried through successfully, however, reflects the growing influence of Marxist ideas, as well as the increased confidence of Marxists themselves in their ability to formulate and express their standpoint on a whole number of contemporary ideological issues in a way that reaches out to new sections of the people. The London "Week" was not an isolated event; in October, audiences of between 150 and 250 came to hear leading Communists in a "Challenge of Marxism" week organised around the book of that title at Manchester University. In November, audiences of between 80 and 100 were attracted to discussions on Socialism and the Arts, Philosophy, and Marxism, held at Leeds. In London the *Marxism Today* Forums, at which Marxists and non-Marxists discuss contemporary issues, continue to attract large audiences, while in the provinces Birmingham has followed suit.

The Week has shown that we have the resources to carry through such events and to make a success of them. These are an essential means of spreading Marxist ideas, and reaching out to new sections of the population. There are many lessons to be drawn from this experience; mistakes were made which can be remedied in the future. But one thing is certain: the way is now clear to organise events of this kind on a larger scale in the months and years to come.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National Liberation Today

(Report delivered to the Executive Committee of the Communist Party on November 10th, 1963)

R. Palme Dutt

I. Aim of Report

The aim of this Report is to cover three main subjects:

(1) New features of the national liberation movement, changes from the old forms of the colonial question, and consequent new questions arising.

(2) Britain's role in relation to the newly independent countries and the new forms of the national liberation struggle.

(3) Current controversies, arising from the discussion in the international communist movement, with regard to the relationship of the national liberation struggle to the world situation, the socialist camp and the international working class, and the struggle for peace.

II. New Features of National Liberation—the Remaining Areas of Colonial Domination

The old form of the colonial question for our Party developed in the period when imperialism controlled five-sixths of the world, and the majority of mankind was under colonial or semi-colonial rule. This period lasted until the Second World War. Our Party, at the centre of the British Empire, the largest world colonial Empire, has from the outset consistently sought to fulfil its responsibility of direct and active alliance with the peoples struggling for freedom from colonial rule. We can be proud of the record of our Party in this battle. The role of comrades like George Allison, Percy Glading and Ben Bradley in India, George Hardy in China, our close contacts with the movement in Ireland or in South Africa, are testimony of this. Our party is the only political party in Britain which has a consistent record of fighting against colonialism. At a time when the second Labour Government was putting 60,000 Indians in prison for the crime of demanding national independence, our comrade Ben Bradley was undergoing four years imprisonment alongside Indian working class leaders in India.

Today the majority of the former colonial peoples have won their political independence. In the last twenty years fifty countries have won political independence. For them the tasks of the national liberation struggle have now become to complete and consolidate their political independence, end the remaining holds of imperialism, win economic independence, and carry through economic and social reconstruction.

But direct colonial rule remains in parts of Asia, Africa and the Caribbean, involving still millions under British rule. In these areas the struggle against colonialism is intense, and is often met with severe resistance, as these are the toughest remaining centres of direct colonialism. Hence our tasks of practical alliance with the liberation struggle of these peoples under British colonial rule reaches still to great heights.

The main areas involved and our policy in relation to them are set out in the Executive Committee statement: *Finish with Colonialism.*

(a) **Southern Rhodesia**

(b) **South Africa** (which is still a sphere mainly of British capital, although formally outside the Commonwealth) and the **High Commission Territories**

(c) **Aden and the Gulf**

(d) **Malaysia** (which is a creation of British imperialism maintained by British armed forces to dominate South-East Asia)

(e) **British Guiana and the Caribbean.** (In relation to Guiana Sandys' outrageous decision at the November Conference, offering no date for independence, and manipulating the electoral system to promote racial division, is a sell-out to the United States)

(f) **Northern Ireland** (which is in fact legally and constitutionally under the domination of British imperialism)

The United Nations resolution of 1960 for immediate self-determination for all colonial peoples has sharpened the issue. The U.N. Committee of twenty-four for the fulfilment of this resolution has performed a valuable function. This policy has been carried by the co-operation of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries with the Afro-Asian countries against the resistance of British, French and U.S. imperialists. This new majority in the United Nations is of profound international significance. The recent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statement in the Chinese Communist Party document on neo-colonialism pouring scorn on this raising of the colonial question in the UNO as equivalent to an appeal to imperialism completely fails to see the international significance of this new majority, representing the alliance of the Socialist and Afro-Asian countries, with the handful of imperialist states exposed as a reactionary minority.

The special problem raised of the very small colonial territories should be seen in this context. The old objection that they are too small to be capable of independent existence is no longer valid in the new conditions. Immediate independence should be accompanied with immediate membership of the United Nations to ensure their full international rights against aggression. Any schemes of federation should be undertaken voluntarily only after self-determination, and not imposed by the ruling imperialist power.

The Labour Party in principle recognises the right of self-determination, but in practice this recognition is always hedged round with qualifications as in the case of territories regarded as too small to be viable. Further, in practice the Labour Party supports the armed actions of British imperialism, as in the recent statement of Gordon Walker of September 18th pledging full support to the Tory Government in any action necessary for the protection of "British interests and property" in relation to the question of Malaysia and Indonesia. Similarly Harold Wilson, at Hamburg in September, declared that Labour's strategic policy in contrast to the Tory emphasis on a fictitious nuclear independence, would be concentrating on "conventional" armaments, to be "strong East of Suez".

III. New Features of National Liberation—the Newly Independent States

The majority of former colonial peoples have now won the establishment and recognition of their countries as independent sovereign states. When Lenin wrote his thesis on the national and colonial question in 1920, the colonies, semi-colonies and Dominions and dependencies accounted for 77.2 per cent of the territory and 69.2 per cent of the population of the world. In 1963 only 7.7 per cent of the world's area and 1.7 per cent of its population remain under the direct domination of colonial rule.

But, while their recognition as independent sovereign states has been established, in the majority of cases their full political independence from imperialism has still to be completed and consolidated. The battle for economic independence is only opening. In some cases, e.g. Suez and the Congo, the most violent offensive and even armed assault of imperialism has taken place after the establishment of independence. In all cases the big imperialist monopolies seek to maintain their hold and exploitation.

In the report on neo-colonialism at the Executive Committee in September 1961 we examined the key features of this new strategy of imperialism to maintain a hold on the newly independent states. Some of the forms of this strategy were characterised, for instance, maintaining hold:

> (a) by direct political means at the time of establishing independence i.e. through partition, as in Ireland, India, Palestine; imposing constitutions which play on division, as in the case of Cyprus or attempted in Kenya; establishing federal regimes based on the most reactionary strata as in Malaysia or the Gulf sheikdoms in the South Arabian Federation;
>
> (b) strategic holds through drawing the countries into imperialist military blocs, as in the case of Pakistan, or the establishment of bases as in Cyprus, Aden, and Malaysia.

Against all these forms of political and strategic domination or indirect influence by imperialism, the peoples of the newly independent countries have conducted an increasingly successful struggle. Bases have been forced to be withdrawn in Eire, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Ceylon. The majority of the newly independent Afro-Asian states follow the general international line of "non-alignment", i.e. refusal to be drawn into the imperialist military blocs (although in the case of India this has been weakened by the Anglo-American imperialist utilisation of the border question to establish considerable penetration by military missions).

Economic Independence

The most important new question developing in the national liberation struggle of the newly independent countries is the struggle for economic independence, which is bound up with economic and social reconstruction at home. Economic exploitation by imperialism has actually been intensified in the recent period also in relation to the newly independent states. It is pointed out on all sides that the richer industrial imperialist nations have been growing richer in the modern period and that the poor, i.e. colonial or ex-colonial, nations have been growing poorer. What is not pointed out is that this is *precisely the effect of intensified colonial exploitation.* One measure of this is shown by the increase in prices of industrial goods which these countries have to buy, and fall in the prices of the primary products, food and raw materials which they sell.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

According to the United Nations *Bulletin of Statistics,* between 1953-1962 the prices of manufactured goods rose by nine per cent while the prices of primary products from under-developed countries fell by 12 per cent and of food from under-developed countries by 22 per cent. The United Nations Report *International Economic Assistance to the Less-Developed Countries in* 1961 shows that between 1953-5 and 1957-9 the loss to the under-developed countries through worsening terms of trade was nearly twice the total of public aid funds to these countries. This is only in reference to the terms of trade. But in fact imperialism draws gigantic profits from ownership of the main economic resources of the colonial and ex-colonial countries. Examples of this will be given later in this Report. Therefore the national liberation battle develops beyond political independence to win possession of the economic resources of their countries. The resolution of the Third All-African Peoples Conference on Neo-Colonialism set out the aim:

> "The nationalisation of the main plantations, banks, transport and industrial enterprises which belong to organisations of imperialism."

This battle for winning the economic resources out of the hands of imperialism is still at an early stage. Iran's nationalisation of the oil industry met with violent resistance and the replacement of the Government of the national bourgeoisie through a military coup organised by imperialism. Similarly Egypt's nationalisation of the Suez Canal was met with aggressive war and invasion by British and French imperialism. Indonesian measures of nationalisation of former Dutch assets have been carried through against intense resistance. The taking over of U.S. monopoly resources in Cuba was followed by the violent anti-Cuba campaign of the United States.

Hence we need to be on the alert for many forms of the further development of this new stage of the national liberation struggle. We need to recognise that this fight is against the same monopolies which exploit the British workers, and that therefore alliance in this fight strengthens both sides.

National Bourgeoisie

These questions are bound up with the internal situation and class relations inside the newly independent countries. In the majority of these countries independence has been won with the national movement under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie; the mass of the population are the peasantry, while the working class is still relatively small in numbers and weakly developed in organisation. Within the national bourgeoisie there are two trends:

(a) towards contradictions and conflict with imperialism, and

(b) towards compromise with imperialism.

One or another trend is dominant at one or another time.

Hence we need to judge each concrete situation and guide our policy in accordance with two main principles:

First, wherever there is active anti-imperialist struggle led by the national bourgeoisie, directly challenging imperialist interests, we should not hesitate to back it, even though the régime of the national bourgeoisie shows reactionary internal features. The classic example of this was the role of Nasser in the war against British and French imperialism in 1956. Nasser was at the same time persecuting and imprisoning Communists inside Egypt. Nevertheless the Egyptian Communists in prison gave full support, as we did, to the anti-imperialist battle led by Nasser.

Second, while supporting any anti-imperialist struggle of the national bourgeoisie, we should always keep in the forefront at the same time, the key importance of the independent development of Marxism and the working class in these countries, since it is only Marxism and the working class which represents the most consistent anti-imperialist fighter and which can solve the problems of internal social and economic development for the future of these countries.

Crucial importance in consequence attaches to the question of the formation of Communist Parties in these countries where they do not yet exist. This question needs to be judged in the light of the concrete situation in each case. A special problem is where the development of the national movement has taken the form of the one-party state (see the article by Jack Woddis on this subject in the August 1963 *Marxism Today*).

These questions will be further discussed in the future Executive Committee report on Africa and Socialism, and are not therefore dealt with here.

Independent National Democracy

The general governing line is set out in the 1960 Declaration of the 81 Communist Parties for the aims of states of independent national democracy:

> "In the present situation favourable domestic and international conditions arise in many countries for the establishment of an independent national democracy, that is a state which (1) consistently upholds its political and economic independence; (2) fights against imperialism and its military blocs, against military bases on its territory; (3) a State which fights against the new forms of colonialism and the penetration of imperialist capital; (4) a State which rejects dictatorial and despotic methods of government;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(5) a State in which the people are ensured broad democratic rights and freedoms (freedom of speech, press, assembly, demonstrations, establishment of political parties and social organisations), and the opportunity to work for the enactment of an agrarian reform and other democratic and social changes, and for participation in shaping Government policy."

These principles of our approach could be worked out concretely in relation to the very varying types of situation in such countries as India, the United Arab Republic, Iraq and Ghana. An adequate analysis of the many complex problems involved in these situations would require a separate study in each case.

IV. Britain and the Newly Independent Countries

The myth of the "end of colonialism" as already accomplished is today the official line of Toryism and right-wing Labour. Rita Hinden writes *Empire And After;* Strachey writes *End of Empire;* Barratt Brown writes *After Imperialism.*

Economic facts prove the opposite. Colonialism is dying, but is by no means yet dead. Colonialism is still the main basis of British capitalism. An analysis of the biggest British monopolies shows that among the top twenty the biggest profits are derived from overseas exploitation.

The *Financial Times* (7.9.63) Table of the twenty companies showing the biggest profits in 1962 gives the following picture:

	Net Profit £ million
Shell Transport & Trading	81.8
British Petroleum	68.1
Imperial Chemical Industries	38.4
British American Tobacco	31.2
Unilever	23.5
Woolworth	15.8
Imperial Tobacco	15.7
Distillers	15.4
Burmah Oil	13.6
Nchanga Conosolidated Copper	12.2
Courtaulds	12.8
Great Universal Stores	12.2
Marks & Spencer	11.1
Guest Keen & Nettlefolds	10.8
Rhokana Corporation	10.7
Rhodesian Anglo-American	9.5
British South Africa	8.5
Coats, Patons & Baldwins	8.3
Tube Investments	7.9
International Publishing Corporation	6.5

It will be seen that the first two are oil giants. Nine out of the twenty (Shell, B.P., British American Tobacco, Imperial Tobacco, Burmah Oil, Nchanga Copper, Rhokana Corporation, Rhodesian Mines, British South Africa), are direct colonial overseas exploiting monopolies and made a total of £221 mn. profits or over half the £414 mn. total profits of the top twenty monopolies. If to these we add Unilevers and I.C.I. whose operations are heavily based on overseas exploitation (Unilevers in West Africa through the United Africa Company, and about one third of I.C.I. and its subsidiaries), the total would be £283 million. On the other hand the total for British industry is £61.7 million, of which only two represent heavy industry, with profits of £18.7 million, four light industry (thread, rayon, distillers, printing and publishing) £43 million, and three distribution, £29 million. A remarkable picture of the economy of an imperialist metropolis.

Official statistical reports conceal the extent of overseas exploitation. Some indications may be drawn from the official Balance of Payments for 1962. In this the return of *Property Income from Abroad,* £1,182 million, is separated from the income of the big imperialist monopolies which have their headquarters in London, and are treated as British Companies making profits in Britain, although the main source of these profits comes from overseas exploitation, e.g. Royal Dutch Shell, British Petroleum, Unilevers, and many of the big banking and insurance companies. *Corporate Income Earned Abroad* by companies in Britain was shown as £1,083 million in 1962.

The problem of the balance of payments is not primarily a problem of paying for necessary imports of food and raw materials by the export of goods. In 1962 the deficit on the visible balance of trade was only £68 million. The big drain arises from the overseas military expenditure (£246 million), and the export of capital, which is mainly directed, not to assist the economic development of the receiving countries, but to intensify exploitation of them.

The extent to which the balance of payments of Britain is covered by overseas exploitation was shown in a report of the *Financial Times* (28.8.62) which stated that during the five years from 1957-61 inclusive "the change in the relationship of export prices to import prices" (i.e. the intensified colonial exploitation) "has seemingly contributed something like £600 million per annum to the strengthening of the U.K.'s payments position". This is equivalent to a total of £3,000 million in five years. In view of this it is not surprising that all the calculations of the directors of the economy and strategy of modern Britain are so heavily concentrated on maintaining and extending imperialist exploitation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Imperialist Strategy

British strategy is still a world imperialist strategy, with the main concentration, alongside the Nato anti-Soviet front, on the dominance of the Persian Gulf for Middle Eastern oil and of South East Asia for rubber, tin and oil. In South East Asia alone the current military costs are said to amount to £100 million a year.

All these costs of Britain's continuing imperialist policy are heavy burdens on the people of Britain. The profits are drawn by the big monopolies, while the burdens fall on the people. These costs are the main obstacle limiting economic reconstruction and social advance at home.

Hence the alliance of the British working class movement with the national liberation struggle of the peoples against British imperialism is not a question of charity or altruistic services to other peoples, but a vital interest of the British people for the people of Britain.

On the question of "aid". The hypocrisy of the official professions of "aid", either as at present practised or as promised by the Labour Party, has been exposed in the preceding analysis of intensified colonial exploitation. In fact the tribute drawn from the overseas peoples far exceeds the so-called "aid". The biggest aid would be to stop drawing the tribute.

Communist Policy

Against this we set out our policy for real aid:

(a) To restore to these countries their economic resources seized by imperialism.

(b) Loans and grants to help the new states embark on large-scale industrialisation, the modernising of their agriculture and the raising of their living standards.

(c) Long-term trading agreements, with steps to establish more equitable price relations between the prices of the raw materials and primary goods exported by the newly independent states and the manufactures and capital goods they import.

Such a policy would open a new perspective for the future development of British trade, industry and employment, in association with the advancement of social and economic reconstruction of the newly independent countries.

V. National Liberation and the Controversy in the International Communist Movement

A special controversy has been raised with regard to the role of the national liberation struggle in the present world situation by the recent statements of the Communist Party of China.

The Chinese Communist Party thesis has set out the following:

(a) That the main contradiction in the present epoch is no longer between socialism and imperialism, but has today "shifted" (in their words) and is now between the national liberation movement and imperialism.

(b) That the three continents of Africa, Asia and Latin America represent the main arena of the world revolution today, and that the outcome in these three continents will be decisive for the world revolution:

> "The various types of contradictions in the contemporary world are concentrated in the vast areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America; these are the most vulnerable areas under imperialist rule and the storm centres of world revolution dealing direct blows at imperialism.
>
> ". . . In a sense therefore, the whole cause of the international proletarian revolution hinges on the outcome of the revolutionary struggles of the people of these areas, who constitute an overwhelming majority of the world population. . . .
>
> 'The centre of world contradiction, of world political struggles, is not fixed but shifts with changes in the international struggles and the revolutionary situation." *Apologists of Neo-Colonialism—People's Daily* and *Red Flag*, October 22, 1963.

(c) That the aim of peaceful coexistence is regarded by the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other Communist Parties as implying the abandonment of the national liberation struggle; that the aim of preventing war is regarded as equivalent to condemnation of just national liberation wars; that the Soviet Union and European Communist Parties have betrayed the national liberation movements to imperialism; and that the oppressed nations are called on to submit to the imperialist oppressors until such time as total disarmament has been achieved throughout the world:

> "The modern revisionists in fact side with the imperialists and colonialists and repudiate and oppose the national liberation movement in every possible way.
>
> "The leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union have been trying by every means to make the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America abandon their revolutionary struggle.
>
> "They often take an attitude of great-power chauvinism and national egoism in matters concerning aid to newly independent countries.
>
> "The leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union hold the victories of the national-liberation revolution are not due primarily to the revolutionary struggles of the masses, and that the people cannot emancipate themselves but must wait for the natural collapse of imperialism through peaceful co-existence and peaceful competition.
>
> "Khrushchov here sounds like a preacher.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Downtrodden people of the world, you are blessed! If only you are patient, if only you wait until the imperialists lay down their arms, freedom will descend upon you.'

"What he really means by looking to the United Nations for help is looking to the imperialists for help.

"The wrong line of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. comp etely abandons the task of fighting imperialism and colonialism and opposes wars of nat.onal liberation."

Of these three propositions the first two, presenting what is known as the "Three Continent Theory" of the world revolution, are contrary to what we understand to be the teachings of Marxism-Leninism and the 1960 Declaration of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. The third, alleging betrayal of the national liberation struggle by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and Communist Parties is plainly and demonstrably contrary to all the facts and the evidence.

The Basic Contradiction

The 1960 Declaration has made clear that the basic contradiction of our epoch is between socialism and imperialism. This definition was already made by Lenin, and is the continuance of the Marxist analysis of the basic contradiction of the last stage of class society between capitalism and the working class. All other contradictions are relative to this main contradiction. Lenin said that since the 1917 Revolution, which undermined the position of world imperialism, the national liberation movement has become part of the world socialist revolution. He declared:

> "The revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue, only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism" (*Lenin's Address to Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organisations of the Peoples of the East*).

There is no doubt that at the present moment the national liberation struggles in Africa, Asia and Latin America are a burning furnace of revolutionary struggle against imperialism, of vital importance for the further advance and victory of the world socialist revolution. *This is not in dispute*. But this advance of the national liberation struggle has only been made possible by the victories and the strength of the socialist camp and the consequent weakening of imperialism; and continued advance is dependent on close co-operation with the socialist camp and the international working class.

Chinese spokesmen claim that their Three-Continent theory of Africa, Asia and Latin America as the main centres of the world revolution today does not exclude the other contradictions or the desirability of association with the world socialist camp. But in practice their simultaneous denunciation of the Soviet Union and most Communist Parties as betraying the national liberation movement is calculated precisely to create a wall of division and distrust between the national liberation movement and the Soviet Union and international working class—which is what the imperialists want.

Three-Continent Theory

Further, the Three-Continent theory is directly contrary to a class understanding of the world situation. For, since the national liberation movement is, as we have seen, led in the majority of countries by the national bourgeoisie, to regard the principal role in the world revolution as being played by the national liberation movement is to place the primary role in the world revolution in the hands of the bourgeoisie instead of in the hands of the international working class and its outcome the world socialist system. This is a complete contradiction of a Marxist-Leninist class approach.

The Three-Continent theory of separation of the national liberation struggle from the socialist camp and the international working class is directly contrary to the vital interests of the national liberation movement in these areas.

It is an illusion to imagine that the difference arises because the Chinese spokesmen in this controversy place more emphasis on the national liberation struggle and are more ardent champions of the national liberation struggle. This illusion, which the ceaseless repetition of general formulas might create among careless readers, is the exact opposite of the truth. For in reality, whatever the subjective intentions of the Chinese comrades to serve the cause of the national liberation struggle, the doctrines which they put forward, embodied in the Three-Continent theory, would be, if accepted, disastrous to the cause of the national liberation struggle.

Prior to 1917 all national liberation struggles were crushed by the superior power of imperialism. I well remember the world of the national liberation movement before 1917, when the leaders of the national movement in India and other countries visited my father in Cambridge, England, and when the Majlis or first association of Asian students, founded in 1907 in honour of the Persian Revolution (Jawaharlal Nehru, then a student, used to be a member, though not very active) met in a room in my father's house. The popular movement in Britain conducted agitation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against the atrocities of imperialism and colonial wars and oppression all over the world. There were ceaseless meetings of protest. Protest against suppression in Egypt, in India, in Persia, in the Congo. Protest followed protest. But before 1917 there were no victories to celebrate. Every meeting was a meeting of protest. Only subsequently to the victory of the socialist revolution in 1917, and still more after the joint victory over fascism in 1945 and the establishment of the world socialist camp, have the victories of national liberation followed.

Today even small countries such as Cuba, Guinea or Ghana are able to defy the overwhelming strength of the most formidable imperialist powers, thanks to the strength and support of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp. This was powerfully shown in the Caribbean crisis of 1962, as in the Suez War of 1956.

Imperialism seeks above all to disrupt this unity of the anti-imperialist camp, embracing the socialist countries, the international working class and the national liberation movement. For this purpose the imperialists spread every kind of propaganda to break this unity, and to urge the newly independent countries to "keep out of the cold war", "beware of the menace of communism" or the supposed expansionist aims of the Soviet Union, and to regard the Soviet Union as merely another great power alongside the imperialist great powers. If this propaganda of division were to succeed, the newly independent nations and national liberation movement would be at the mercy of imperialism.

Gospel of Separation

Similarly the most reactionary right wing nationalist elements in the newly independent countries preach the same gospel of separation from the socialist camp and international working class, from Marxism or Communism. They seek to distort the correct policy of "non-alignment", i.e., refusal to enter imperialist military blocs (there are no socialist-organised military blocs of newly independent countries) as if it meant equally opposition to socialism and imperialism. They preach the theory of the role of the newly independent countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America as a "Third Force" independent of either socialism or capitalism. This plays into the hands of imperialist disruption and neo-colonialism. This doctrine represents the interests of the right wing upper class elements of the national bourgeoisie who fear the advance of the workers and peasants and popular progressive democratic movement and move in practice towards compromise with imperialism. They misuse the term "socialism" to cover this doctrine of separation.

In the same way Right-Wing Social Democracy in the imperialist countries preaches the same gospel, proclaiming the Afro-Asian nations to represent a "Third Force" independent of socialism or imperialism, and thereby seek to smuggle through their real anti-communist, anti-Soviet aims.

In the most extreme form this theory takes on the character of racialism, and seeks to replace the real division between the interests of the imperialist oppressors and the national liberation movement and working masses by a false division supposedly based on colour, between white and coloured races. The camp of socialism, as represented by the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries are thus combined in a single category with the imperialist countries as "white". From a deeply oppressed African or American Negro just beginning to awaken to active struggle, this elementary confusion of national and class oppression with a supposed absolute alignment according to colour is understandable, to be met with full sympathy, and can be rapidly helped to advance to political clarity. But from the lips of a Communist any hint of such an outlook is unpardonable.

Verbal propaganda of this type, as at the Moshi Afro-Asian Conference, has been carried much further than in the written documents. In the Afro-Asian Conference of Journalists the Chinese representatives demanded the exclusion of Soviet representatives as not Asiatic, although the Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union were the first Asian nations to overthrow colonialism and win national freedom. A similar shameful approach has been shown in the plan for an Afro-Asian Trade Union Conference excluding Soviet representatives.

Sometimes this line of division to conceal the real division between imperialism and anti-imperialism is presented as a division between "have" and "have not" countries. In this way the Socialist Soviet Union, which has no imperialist interests, export of capital for investment or foreign exploitation, is lumped in a single category with the imperialist countries which exploit the colonial peoples and maintain their economy on the basis of this exploitation. This shameless presentation equally serves the interests of disrupting the anti-imperialist camp.

False Charges

The charge against the Soviet Union of neglecting action on behalf of the national liberation struggle is a complete falsification of the facts. The main support of the national liberation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struggle in every case, both through the strength of armed power to counter-balance the power of imperialism, through the direct supply of arms where the national liberation struggle has had to take the armed form, and the supply of every kind of material and technical aid for economic reconstruction, has consistently come from the Soviet Union. Every national leader has borne witness to this:

> "Without the existence of the Soviet Union the Socialist Revolution in Cuba would not have been possible" (Fidel Castro).
>
> "The Soviet Union proved to be the only great power which from the very beginning supported the people of the Congo in their struggle" (Patrice Lumumba).
>
> "Were it not for the existence of the Soviet Union, the movement for freedom from colonial oppression in Africa would have felt the full force of brutal suppression" (Kwame Nkrumah).

The whole experience of the modern period, Suez in 1956, Syria in 1957, Iraq in 1958, Indonesia in 1960, Cuba in 1962, has demonstrated the truth of this.

With regard to the role of our Communist Party in the national anti-imperialist struggle, we can say that we have never failed to give full support to every national anti-imperialist struggle, whether violent or non-violent, armed or unarmed without qualification. We can say this at the same time as we fully recognise the inadequacy of our efforts compared to the needs. When it was a question of the battle of the Kenya people, with Kenyatta at their head, denounced by the imperialists in terms of their description of Mau Mau, we alone of political parties, as Kenyatta well knows, gave full support to the struggle of the Kenya people. We stood by the armed struggle of the Malayan people. We support today the South African people's struggle, also when they find that, denied every democratic outlook, they are compelled to advance to armed struggle. It is a slander to describe our Communist Party as supporting imperialism or failing to support the national anti-imperialist fight.

The struggle for peace, disarmament and peaceful co-existence corresponds to the vital interests of the national liberation movement. The 1960 Declaration has made clear that the aim of peaceful co-existence does not exclude just wars of national liberation. But it is precisely the war plans of imperialism which seek to entangle the newly independent countries in imperialist military blocs, and thereby nullify their independence. Similarly the first nuclear offensive of imperialism was conducted against an Asian country, and the nuclear tests of imperialism have always been conducted in Afro-Asian regions. The peoples of the newly independent countries like the colonial peoples struggling for freedom have the same common interests with the peoples of the socialist countries and in the capitalist countries to prevent a nuclear war and win the aims of peaceful co-existence and nuclear disarmament. Every step towards the fulfilment of these aims improves the conditions for the advance of the national liberation struggle.

Unity and Solidarity

The unity of the world anti-imperialist movement, the socialist camp, the international working class and the national liberation movement is vital for the victory of the aims of peace and of world socialism.

We are confident that this unity will be fulfilled, and that the fulfilment of this unity will bring victory equally for the final end of colonialism and for our cause in Britain, for peace and socialism.

In this Report I have not dealt with the detail questions of our practical policy in the various spheres on this issue or in relation to the various countries, as this is set out in the Executive Committee policy statement *Finish with Colonialism*. But I would only say this in conclusion.

We are pledged as a party, and we need all of us to strive to achieve, by our activity and our response, the fullest solidarity with the national liberation struggle of all the peoples fighting to complete their independence from imperialism, as well as with the coloured citizens in our midst struggling against every form of discrimination and disability, in brotherhood and alliance for our common aims.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Marx's View of Alienation

John Lewis

IN 1843 Thomas Carlyle wrote and published a volume of essays entitled *Past and Present,* which included a forthright and eloquent attack on "the dismal science" of political economy as it was then presented by Mill, MacCulloch and other leading economists. "An economic system," said Ruskin, "which considers men as actuated by no other moral influences than those which affect rats or swine." In his *Gospel of Mammonism* Carlyle furiously attacked the whole system. "Supply and demand is not the Law of Nature: Cash payment is not the sole nexus of man with man—how far from it!" From the pursuit of monetary aims man will utterly fail to achieve happiness. "Perpetual mutiny, contention, hatred, isolation, execration shall wait on his footsteps, till all men discern that the thing which he attains, however golden it look or be, is not success, but the want of success. . . . We, with our Mammon Gospel have come to strange conclusions. We call it a society; and go about professing openly the totalest separation, isolation. Our life is not a mutual helpfulness, but rather, cloaked under due laws of war, named 'competition' and so forth, it is a mutual hostility. We have profoundly forgotten everywhere that *Cash-payment* is not the sole relation of human beings; we think, nothing doubting, that *it* absolves and liquidates all engagements of man. . . . Verily Mammon-worship is a melancholy creed."

Classical Economists

Engels, who was in England on behalf of his father's firm of Ermen and Engels, read this. He already had nothing but contempt for the bourgeoisie, who held egoism to be the driving force of society. He was confirmed in this judgment by the picture of capitalist society which Carlyle had drawn in his essays. Engels declared that he was the only cultured man in England who was really troubled by the moral problems of the society he lived in. Carlyle's bitter condemnation of this lamentable state of affairs and of the utter corruption of all social institutions was warmly praised by Engels in a lengthy review of *Past and Present,* which he wrote for the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher* at the end of 1843. But Carlyle's analysis of the sickness of an acquisitive society was not enough for him. He found it incredible that such a bold writer could pitilessly condemn the system of open competition, and still not realise that private property was the root of the evil.

Engels quickly followed this review with his *Sketch for a Critique of Political Economy* in the same Journal (1844). This was the first Marxist analysis of capitalist economics; in it he pointed out that in the metropolis of the world's industries, where production was rising to an amazing level, the masses were still ground by poverty because they could not obtain or consume the products of their own labours. He was deeply moved to find that "the unreasoning, unfeeling mechanism of open competition" was deified by Adam Smith and the whole classical school of economists, who considered the system of private property necessary and indestructible.

It should be remembered that it was in June 1843 that the young Marx, who had just married Jenny von Westphalen, arrived in Paris to edit, along with Arnold Ruge, the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher.* Marx knew nothing of economics, nothing of modern industrialism, nothing of the working class movement in Britain, the most advanced and class conscious in the world. He knew nothing of socialism. Now he began to learn. The French socialist movement first engaged his attention, and then Engels revealed the nature of the capitalist economy, and the cruel anomalies and contradictions in which it was involved. In 1844 he began to write what have come to be called the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts,* or simply the *Paris Manuscripts.* The first of these he devoted to the *Wages of Labour* and the *Profit of Capital,* in which he concluded that: "Political economy knows the worker only as a working animal, as a beast reduced to the strictest bodily needs."

Of course Marx had still a long way to go before his analysis of capitalism was complete. In 1847 he criticised the economic views of Proudhon in his *Poverty of Philosophy,* and delivered in Brussels the lectures to working men in which he first expounded the labour theory of value (*Wage Labour and Capital*). One thing he had clearly grasped, and that was the reduction of human labour to a commodity. This was to be the theme of all his later work.

Hegel had a strange philosophical explanation for this alienation, which, however, Marx was to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

show, had a profound truth embodied in it. Hegel said that man both gained and at the same time lost his independent personality in the process of creating the world of objects through labour. For these objects come to confront him as hostile to him. The very world that he creates stands over against him as an enemy.

Hegel on Alienation

This whole process of creative labour, Hegel said, was due to the Absolute emptying itself, abrogating itself, losing itself, in Nature. But somehow it must work its passage home again, come to itself once more. The subsequent development of man through work and the building of civilisation, by which man at the same time creates his world and creates himself, is this return to full self-consciousness, to the unity and completeness of the Absolute as it was in the beginning.

Marx however, came to socialism deeply impressed by a widely accepted theory of the human condition known as human *alienation*. Hegel, who was by no means a merely abstract thinker and had been a radical in his younger days, saw contemporary man as somehow deprived, estranged, lost. He was acutely aware of the fact that antagonistic private interests were pre-eminent in all fields and therefore society could not be called a true community. He saw too the complete subordination of the individual to the demon of abstract labour, the blind and anarchic character of a society governed by exchange relationships, "a vast system of communality and mutual interdependence a moving life of the dead. A system moving hither and thither like a blind beast."[1]

Never mind the nonsense in this, said Marx. Get hold of the main idea: Man creates himself and his world through labour. And Hegel was right: in capitalist society man gains much but he loses much. He does create in the machine and in the commodities which are the fruit of his labour, enemies to himself; he does himself become alienated, lost, deprived.

Now Feuerbach, to whom both Marx and Engels were immensely indebted, had also criticised Hegel's notion of alienation, but from a different angle. It is not, he said, that the Absolute by limiting itself produces man as estranged. That is to put things upside down. Man himself creates his own alienation by projecting his real essence, his manhood, even his potential virtues, on to God, on to the Absolute. Man despoils his own nature by exteriorising in God what really belongs only to humanity. To give back to man his true social being the religious illusion must be dissipated. God is but man's own nature, abstracted from himself and projected into the skies—or, philosophically, into the Absolute.

A Rational Explanation

Marx agreed that there was indeed no need to attribute man's disinheritance to anything mystical, to the self-limitation of the Absolute. Why should man make the disheartening mistake of stripping himself of his own qualities and projecting them upon God? Marx had a better, an altogether more rational explanation—an economic one. Had not Engels shown quite clearly in his exposition of the economic contradictions of capitalism how man gets into this position of deprivation and humiliation?

And how was man to be redeemed? According to Feuerbach, rationalist criticism would convince man of his error. According to Hegel the full consciousness of what was really taking place would reconcile man to his condition. But Marx saw clearly that man recovers himself only in a higher form of society, in which the means of production are communally owned. Only in such a community will man find in his relations with others the realisation of his true self.

When Marx became aquainted with Engels, and with all that the French socialists had to say about human exploitation and degradation, all this became abundantly clear to him. It was when man created his world of objects *as commodities* under capitalism, within the system of private ownership, wage-labour and profit, that the products of his labour confront him as an enemy, that his manhood is stripped from him, that he becomes a mere object himself. It was not the Absolute that was responsible. It was, as Feuerbach said, man himself who had done this to himself. But Marx saw that this was not a mere intellectual error, but something which was bound up with the process of capitalist production, with private ownership.

Alienated Labour

When he had completed his first two economic studies in 1844 Marx at once took up the theme of alienation or estrangement and proceeded to elucidate it in the light of the new critique of political economy. In his two essays entitled *Alienated Labour* and *Private Property and Communism* he expounds the basic idea of alienation later to be worked out in economic terms in the

[1] Hegel, *Jensener Realphilosophie.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theory of commodities. The money economy is a system in which above all things labour is bought and sold and the worker has become a commodity. What man himself has produced, and which therefore contains something of himself, becomes an alien power opposed to him which enslaves him instead of being controlled by him. Even the instrument of labour, the machine, confronts the worker as mere mechanism that dominates and pumps dry his living labour power. When a worker is hired we purchase the man with his labour and he becomes a mere tool or instrument, a commodity, a thing, so that when engaged in the labour process his real personality no longer exists even for himself.

This human individuality, human morality itself, becomes a commercial object, and all economic and commercial relations have been transformed from personal relationships into the impersonal operations of the market. The only human bond in commerce is the exchange value which equates commodities that fetch the same price.

Of course Marx subsequently made a much more complete study of the labour process, and developed his whole economic system as the result of wide study; but all this was the development and not the contradiction of his earlier position. When in the exposition of his developed system he describes labour power as a "commodity" that its possessor, the worker, surrenders up to capital and declares: "But the exercise of labour power, labour, is the worker's own life-activity, his own life expressions. Thus his life-activity is for him only a means to enable him to exist. He works in order to live. He does not even reckon labour as part of his life, it is rather the sacrifice of his life;"[2] this is but the picture of alienated labour in the Manuscripts of 1844 which he thus describes: The worker produces commodities for profitable sale; he surrenders, through the wage contract, the product of his labour. Capital is power to dispose over the products of labour. The more the worker produces, the greater the power of capital becomes and the smaller the worker's own means for appropriating his products. The more the worker produces the more he comes under the sway of his product of capital. Once turned to the laws of capitalist commodity, production, labour is impoverished and negated.[3]

This splitting of man we also see in the separation of the interests of the individual from those of the community, in the separation of intellectual and manual activities. Moreover, this is the economic process that brings into existence economic forces existing outside men, the origin and end of which they are ignorant and which they cannot control.[4]

Marx already sees in 1844 this process of exploitation as an irresistible force which now rules all men, capitalists as well as workers. There is a compulsion here that transforms free creative self-activity into alienated labour, into the compulsion to amass wealth, into a maniacal obsession with the accumulation of capital, a veritable fanaticism of appropriation, a lust for money. "The only wheels that set political economy in motion are greed and the war between the greedy—competition." This is the "utterly alien power, the inhuman force" that holds sway over the whole of human existence.[5]

A Really Human Society

How is this to be overcome? Not by going back to a pre-capitalist system of small producers or to the mercantile system, but by going forward to make society really human, by organising work in a co-operative fashion to serve human ends. Man is thus liberated in all spheres—industry, law, family, science and art. All can now affirm man's nature instead of denying it.[6]

The problem is "to organise the empirical world in such a manner that man experiences in it the truly human, becomes accustomed to experience himself as a man, to assert his true individuality". But to abolish the acquisitive movement and emancipate man from the incubus of greed, cannot be done until we wrest power from the hands of the capitalist class in which the inhuman force is incarnate. Only a society in which the means of production are communally and not privately owned produces the basis for genuinely co-operative human relations and only in such a community will man find in his relations with others the realisation of his manhood. Society is the necessary framework through which freedom and individuality are made realities, but not, as Hegel thought, in Society as such and as found in the State, but only in a socialist society. Marx emphatically

[2] All this was later embodied, elaborated and wrought into his complete system of economic and social thinking in the sections in *Capital* on *Commodities and Labour Power,* and in the *Mystery of the Character of Commodities* in Ch. 1, *The Labour Process and the Production of Surplus Value* in Ch. V and *The Transformation of the Value of the Price of Labour Power in Wages* in Ch. XVII.

[3] *Paris MSS.*

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Ibid.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declared that in such a society "above all one must avoid setting 'society' up again as an abstraction opposed to the individual" (as Hegel had done). "The individual *is* the social entity. His life is therefore an expression and verification of social life."[7]

Dialectical Kernel

Marx now returns to Hegel both to show the importance of his theory of man's self-creation through labour and of the dialectical principle involved—which became the key to his whole system of thought, and also to strip the theory of its idealist character, of the myth of the Absolute and its self-limitation in the creation of the physical world and man. This he does in the same series of essays, the *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts,* and not, as some have imagined, in his later works. The extraction of the dialectical kernel from Hegel and the rejection of the idealist husk is the theme of the *Critique of the Hegelian Dialectic and Philosophy as a Whole* (1844).[8] Hegel's conception of a self-alienated God, he says, is really a portrait of man as an economic producer. In the *Phenomenology* Hegel had shown man as creating himself in productivity—"labour is the self-reproductive act of man". But Hegel considered all productivity as no more than an expression of the thought process. As a consequence, says Marx, "he has only discovered the abstract, logical and speculative expression for the movement of history, but not yet the real history of man". In fact what Hegel sees as spirit producing itself in work and finding itself confronted with an alien world, is man producing himself and finding himself in an alienated condition. Thus the history of production is not anything so mystical as the process of spirit's "becoming" in terms of knowledge. The dialectic stands on its head. "You must turn it right way up again if you want to discover the rational kernel that is hidden away within the wrappings of mystification."

This Marx proceeded to do, taking Hegel's theory of alienation as the model of his own philosophy of history, the model which, in spite of the universal form which Hegel gives it, is the indispensable key to the actual sequence of events in economic and social development. The whole theory of alienation therefore is far more than a moral protest against the inhumanity of capitalism. It is the constitutive act of Marxism.

[7] *Paris MSS.*

[8] This is briefly alluded to in the Preface to the Second Edition of *Capital;* and the full exposition he there refers to is of course this *Critique.*

Marx does not reject the philosophy of Hegel, but, as Engels says, "while its form had to be annihilated through criticism, the new content which had been won through it had to be saved".[9] So treated, the theory shows man's economic life under capitalism to be a life of alienated labour. In this conception "there lie concealed all the elements of criticism, already prepared and elaborated, in a manner rising far above the Hegelian standpoint".

It points, in fact, to the history of the world as a process by which man makes himself fully man; as the self realisation of man in the collective sense. Man is fundamentally a productive being, a creator, in both the material and the spiritual sense. He creates the means of his physical life, but he also creates art, the family, political institutions, religion, law and morals. He is endowed with a multitude of creative capacities. Even machines and factories are materialised factors of man's self-expression, of man's self-externalisation. What he produces when he is at last confronted with his man-made environment is a reflexion and externalisation of himself. Man is a world creator and in making and remaking the world he makes and remakes himself. This then is the *realisation* of man.

Creative Work

But Hegel is also gravely in error in supposing that this objective world is alien and hostile because the world that man creates necessarily constitutes a limit and fetter for spirit. This is not the essence of the matter. The source of deprivation is not in the productive process itself, but in the process as we find it under capitalism and other systems of exploitation. It is the *wage-labourer* that is alienated from himself, when he is made into a commodity, when he is depersonalised in the act of capitalist production.

But production need not have this result, and does not when it is freed from the distortion of the capitalist economic structure. Then man can enhance his personality by creative work, not diminish it.

Marx has then to show that under capitalism this alienation does in fact take place and is inevitable. He turns therefore to the economists and shows that their whole system, the operation of their own economic laws, changes personal relations among men into the mechanical relations of the production and exchange of commodities, a result which they regard as something natural and necessary.

How then can man engaged in creative work

[9] Engels, *Feuerbach.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repossess himself? Not, as Hegel thought, by intellectual illumination, by a philosophic sleight of hand, but by making the process of production a really human one. This implies the abolition of the capitalist system, which is the negation of human nature. Nor can this be supposed to happen automatically. It must result from the action of men's understanding and will.

No attempt to patch or mitigate the evils of capitalism while preserving the system will suffice, because they all allow the depersonalisation of labour to continue. The existing order must be replaced by a new one in which men share in common ownership and work collectively for the satisfaction of their needs. Here man will find himself in his products, instead of losing himself. Here too the opposition between the individual and society, between man and nature, that arises out of the system of alienated labour will disappear.

Continuity of Marx's Thought

It has been said that Marx dropped the whole notion of alienation and human depersonalisation in his later works, which are declared to be destitute of any interest in the individual. The true Marx, it is asserted, is only to be found in these earlier essays; thereafter he becomes a mere political economist. It has further been argued that in the *Paris Manuscripts* Marx shows himself to be imbued with Hegelian idealism, concerned with abstract notions of man's essence, humaneness, etc.[10]

But is it true that Marx in his later works abandons the view that capitalism is essentially inhumane and destructive of human personality? Did he lose interest in the development of all the faculties and powers of man as the ultimate aim of socialism? It is surely very far from the case that the works of Marx after 1844, and especially *Capital,* ignore the depersonalisation of man by the capitalist economic system. It is only the word "alienation", and a few similar expressions, that are dropped, since they belong to the academic period of Marx's life when everybody talked in these current Hegelian terms. But the meaning he always gave them, whether in 1844 or later, was unmistakeably realistic and not idealistic. Even in *Capital,* as he himself confesses, he sometimes "toyed with the use of Hegelian terminology", but when he did so he was not lapsing into the Hegelian preoccupation with purely logical and mental development! Nor does he do so when he uses the term "alienation" in 1844.

The fact that Marx no longer uses the term "alienation" does not, in the least, affect the meaning of what he is saying, which is exactly the same as in 1844. In *Capital* he still sees in money the power over all things, and in the acquisitive mania a will-to-power in pecuniary guise.[11] What was originally described as the passion of greed is not denied in *Capital* but emphasised and expanded. The inhumanity of capitalism is drawn with a descriptive power far surpassing that shown in the *Paris Manuscripts.* The only difference is that he speaks of wage-labour instead of alienated labour—the latter term having lost its currency. *Capital* shows with even greater force, because it is now set before us concretely with a great mass of factual data, man being dehumanised and destroyed by a tyrannical force of acquisitiveness that is part of his nature as capitalist man.

This force controls his movements, usurps his life and energies, torments him mercilessly, drives him relentlessly to expand capital investment endlessly and for its own sake. At the same time the dehumanised victim of the compulsive drive towards absolute enrichment is aware of his dehumanisation and rebels against the force responsible for reducing him to this state. Between seller and consumer "the only force that brings them together and puts them into relation with each other is the selfishness, the main and the private interest of each. Each looks to himself only and no one troubles himself about the rest".[12]

Thus the association between employer and worker is dominated by a basic indifference to human beings, a depersonalisation which, Marx says, "converts the worker into a cripple, a monster, by forcing him to develop some highly specialised dexterity, at a cost of a world of productive impulses and faculties".[13]

The Individual

In the factory we have a lifeless mechanism independent of the worker, who becomes its mere living appendage. The worker "does not fulfil himself in his work, but denies himself. He therefore only feels at one with himself away from work. While in work he feels *estranged* from

[10] These views have been advanced by some religious thinkers, dissident Marxists, existentialists, and philosophical scholars such as Daniel Bell, *In Search of Marxist Humanism,* Soviet Survey (April-June 10) and Karl Lowth in *Social Research* (Summer 1954) etc.

[11] In the *Paris Manuscripts* there is a long passage in the essay on *The Power of Money* in which Marx quotes from and expounds Shakespeare's *Timon of Athens.* In *Capital* he makes use of the same quotation in a footnote which repeats in briefer form his earlier commentary.

[12] *Capital,* Vol. I.

[13] *Capital,* Vol. I.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

himself".[14] The worker can exist as capital only as long as capital exists to use him. The existence of capital is his existence; it shapes the content of his life, though remaining indifferent to it. Thus he becomes no more than a commodity in human form, an individual not belonging to himself but alienated from himself. Right through *Capital* to the last pages of *Volume III* Marx continually stresses the dehumanising effects of capitalism, which he defines as "a special form of the development of the productive power of labour, in such a way that these powers appear as self-dependent powers of capital lording it over labour and standing in direct opposition to the labourer's own development". This is what happens to man in the production of commodities under capitalism when the product comes to rule the man who produces it and an uncontrolled economy legislates over all human relations.

Alienation then so far from being forgotten remains the central theme through all his later writing as with increasing clarity he shows it to be a phase of social and economic development that is moving towards its own negation.

Nor do we have to wait for *The German Ideology* to appear before we come upon the explicit rejection of the Hegelian idealism with which, it has been alleged, Marx was still enmeshed; for he rejects it in the *Paris Manuscripts* itself. "This alienation for Hegel is the opposition within thought itself, between abstract thinking and sensuous reality, and is therefore an occult critique, still to itself obscure and mystifying, and not the *real* estrangement of the human being." And Marx proceeds to show that alienation appears in the relation of the worker to the product of his labour.

Nor is Marx concerned with vague aspirations for "humaneness", for the emancipation of "mankind". It is for precisely such vapid idealism that he criticises the *"True Socialists"* in *The German Ideology* and in the *Manifesto*. It is not by moral exhortation that man is to be emancipated but by taking advantage of the fact that economic conditions have now developed to the point where it becomes necessary to reorganise society on the basis of common ownership—which does in fact restore true human relations in industry so that "all the faculties and powers of the individual are developed", and that the antagonistic, competitive splitting up of mankind into a war of all against all, which is the negation of individuality, is at last overcome.

For Lenin Marx's conception of socialism was not merely "the method of adding to the efficiency of production" and escaping the frustrating contradictions of capitalism, but "the only method of producing fully developed human beings". (Lenin, *Karl Marx*.) One could find hundreds of extracts from *Capital* which passionately express Marx's deep concern for the value of the individual and his consistent determination "to overthrow all conditions in which man is a humiliated, enslaved, despised and rejected being".[15]

Essence of Man

When Marx speaks of "universal man", of the "essence" of man, he is not referring to some transcendental and abstract concept as though it had a being of its own, some ready-made entity or category out of which the real man could be produced. This whole idealist attitude he subjects to merciless ridicule in *The Holy Family* which appears only a few months after he had completed the *Paris Manuscripts*. He tells us precisely what the essence of man really is: it is "the ensemble of the social relations", in other words, concrete man in society, and not isolated but living in fellowship. Something indeed that so far from being an abstraction can only be understood historically, because it comes to being only in history, in the process of social and economic development. It cannot therefore be perceived *as such* behind and above each separate man, as if it could have an existence prior to and independent of actual men. (*Theses on Feuerbach*, 1845.) That it could ever be supposed that Marx in 1844 (or indeed at any other time) was an idealist in this sense (or in any other sense) is difficult to imagine.

Nor must it be thought that by "the unfolding of man" Marx was lapsing into the idealism he derided in *The Holy Family*. If he was, then it is not in the *Paris Manuscripts* that we find this expression, but in *Capital*. It is here that he speaks of "the self-realisation of the person" and of "fully developed human beings", of "the full development of the human race".

The view that Marx had abandoned his earlier views when he came to write *Capital* suggests either a failure to appreciate the dialectical elements in developed Marxism and an attempt to separate the sociology of Marxism from its economics, or an inadequate comprehension of the earlier Marxism, since if this is really understood, the later Marxism will be seen to be its explication, and its application to the history of capitalism.

[14] *Capital*, Vol. III. The word used for "estrange" is *entfremden* (=alienate).

[15] Marx, *Introduction to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Rights.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Necessity of Art

R. F. Willetts

IT is a pleasure to welcome the appearance, in an English version of this important work by Ernst Fischer[1], which deserves to make an impact in this country comparable with that already made on the Continent by the book in its original form.[2] It should, in particular, stimulate Marxists here to extend the impressive body of original studies in the field of Marxist aesthetics already represented by the writings of John Berger, Christopher Caudwell, Ralph Fox, T. A. Jackson, Arnold Kettle, Jack Lindsay, George Thomson and Alick West.

The author impresses the reader by his confident ease of presentation, his freedom from jargon, cant and dogmatism, his wide knowledge coupled with modesty, above all by his conviction of the value of the arts, in the past, the present and the future. He is equally successful in conveying a sense of the enormous profit he has derived from his long study of Marxism. He is never a preacher with a Bible, but always a man with a method, which proves its value in application.

Scope of the Book

The book is divided into five chapters. The first, on *The Function of Art*, is prefatory and brief, designed to clarify the author's fundamental premise: "Art is necessary in order that man should be able to recognise and change the world. But art is also necessary by virtue of the magic inherent in it." The second, on *The Origins of Art*, explores this premise further from the viewpoint that art is almost as old as man; that it is a form of work; and that work is an activity peculiar to mankind. The longest chapters, the third and fourth, are concerned with *Art and Capitalism* and *Content and Form*. A final short chapter is devoted to *The Loss and Discovery of Reality*, based upon the judgement, established by the preceding argument, that the "loss of reality" has grown into a central problem in the highly industrialised late capitalist world. This leads to a confident conclusion:

> "Man, who became man through work, who stepped out of the animal kingdom as transformer of the natural into the artificial, who became therefore, the magician, man the creator of social reality, will always stay the great magician, will always be Prometheus bringing fire from heaven to earth, will always be Orpheus enthralling nature with his music. Not until humanity itself dies will art die."

The book is thus principally concerned with the situation of the arts in the contemporary European world, their immediate past history, and also with the parallel existence of a capitalist and a socialist art. Fischer does not shirk the responsibility of critically examining certain aspects of the development of the arts under socialism. Equally welcome is his generous sympathy with the special difficulties of the genuine artist in the capitalist world. He explains: "The late bourgeois world is still capable of producing art of importance (and the existence and challenge of the socialist world, the moral and intellectual issues which it poses, are of considerable help here). But in the long-term view socialist art has the advantage over late bourgeois art. The latter, although it has much to offer, lacks one thing: a vision of the future, a hopeful historical perspective. Despite disappointments, this vision still belongs to the socialist world. It is far more than a question of bread and space rockets, prosperity and technical perfection: it is a matter of the 'meaning of life', a meaning that is not metaphysical but humanist." It is refreshing to find, in this connection, full recognition of the stature of Kafka's work and a worthy Marxist analysis of that masterly portrayer of alienation.

Fischer's method of procedure is selective, allusive and sometimes repetitive. He is always prepared to step back from his work to look at it from another angle, to make the same point in a variety of ways, to hark back to a previous line of argument. He is at his best on poetry and painting, frankly tentative about music and (perhaps aware of the shadow of Lukács?) avoids extensive treatment of the novel, though he does refer to the work of a few novelists. Fischer's wide range is impressive and it may seem ungenerous to point out that his book is thoroughly Europocentric. But that, as we shall see, does need to be said.

Origins of Art

In the vitally necessary chapter on *The Origins of Art*, Fischer, accepting that primitive magic gradually became differentiated into religion, science and art, owes much, as he warmly acknowledges, to the work of George Thomson—in this chapter and elsewhere. But he has not been content merely to

[1] *The Necessity of Art, A Marxist Approach*. Pelican Books, 4s. 6d.

[2] *Von der Notwendigkeit der Kunst*, first published by Verlag der Kunst, Dresden, 1959.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

repeat: he has developed Thomson's work in a number of directions, notably in his discussion of the sexual, in relation to the economic, significance of totem and taboo, and also in his persuasive account of the development of tools in relation to aesthetics. He argues that a system of completely new relationships between one species and the rest of the world came about through the use of tools: "In the working process, the natural relationship of cause and effect was, as it were, reversed; the anticipated, foreseen effect became, as 'purpose', the legislator of the working process". Fischer has reflected deeply upon the implications of that suggestive definition of Marx which he quotes to substantiate his argument:

> "We have to consider labour in a form peculiar to the human species. A spider carries on operations resembling those of a weaver; and many a human architect is put to shame by the skill with which a bee constructs her cell. But what from the very first distinguishes the most incompetent architect from the best of bees, is that the architect has built a cell in his head before he constructs it in wax. The labour process ends in the creation of something which, when the process began, already existed in the worker's imagination, already existed in an ideal form. What happens is not merely that the worker brings about a change of form in natural objects; at the same time, in the nature that exists apart from himself, he realises his own purposes, the purpose which gives the law to his activities, the purpose to which he has to subordinate his own will."

One only regrets that Fischer could not have made this chapter longer, perhaps by documenting some of his conclusions. For example, the section on the role of the artist in early class society in guiding individual life back into collective life, the personal into the universal, so as to restore the lost unity of man, might have been illustrated by ampler reference to the *Oresteia* of Aeschylus, that hardly surpassed masterpiece of European literature; or from the magnificent speech of Aristophanes in Plato's *Symposium*, with its fantastic and searching irony, on the theme of man's search for completion; or from Aristophanes's more direct and astringent treatment of man's lost unity in his last play *Plutus* (*Wealth*).

Art and Capitalism

The fine chapter on *Art and Capitalism* rightly begins by discussing the consequences of large-scale commodity production:

> "The artist in the capitalist age found himself in a highly peculiar situation. King Midas had turned everything he touched into gold: capitalism turned everything into a commodity . . . dissolved the old world into a cloud of whirling molecules . . . flung all products on to an anonymous market to be bought or sold. . . . The work of art was subjected more and more to the laws of competition."

The result was that: "For the first time in the history of mankind the artist became a 'free' artist, a 'free' personality, free to the point of absurdity, of icy loneliness. Art became an occupation that was half-romantic, half commercial." Because, as Fischer says, Romanticism was the dominant attitude of European art and literature from the time of Rousseau's *Discourses* until *The Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels, Romanticism and related successive movements—the re-discovery of folk art, art for art's sake, impressionism, naturalism, symbolism and mysticism—are naturally discussed at some length.

Fischer is especially perceptive here in his analysis of German romanticism and also of the works of Baudelaire, to which he must have devoted much concentrated study. He views English romanticism from a Continental standpoint and this perhaps accounts for the attention paid to Byron, Shelley and Keats and the almost total neglect of Wordsworth. Wordsworth occupies a special position in the English Romantic movement and we might have expected at least some mention of the highly significant *Preface to the Lyrical Ballads* (1800). Here Wordsworth, without foresight of the massive urbanisation that has since occurred, yet complained about "the increasing accumulation of men in cities", as one of a number of forces operating to blunt "the discriminating powers of the mind".

The literary movements which followed upon Romanticism are naturally not treated with the detailed formal attention of Edmund Wilson's *Axel's Castle*, but Fischer is more searching in his analysis of social motivation. The English reader could profitably supplement Fischer on modern movements in painting with some recent (all too brief) articles by John Berger in *Labour Monthly*. Though Berger is more defensive in his analysis of the positive achievements, despite overriding subjectivism, his sensitive guidance recalls and adds weight to Fischer's thesis. Again, Fischer's knowledge of English poetry seems to extend only as far as Yeats and Eliot—there is one (rather misleading) reference to Auden—and there is no mention of Caudwell. True, Fischer knows O'Casey, but the literary movement of the 'thirties, of which Caudwell was a part and, at the same time, by far its most important Marxist critic, needs to be set beside the Continental movements which produced Eluard, Aragon and Brecht. The omissions are striking. If Beckett, why not Caudwell? Or MacDiarmid? If the American beatnik poets, why not the English radicals of the 'thirties, when, for the first time, our literature became widely (if not deeply) influenced by Marxism? Perhaps it is partly our own fault. Few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

English Marxists have discussed Caudwell or modern poetry in the last twenty years.

Socialist Realism?

Fischer has important things to say about dehumanisation in all its forms as an element of late bourgeois art, about fragmentation, mystification, the flight from society, the development of realism. Perhaps "critical realism" ought not to be so strictly confined as a category to bourgeois art as Fischer appears to assume, but his definition serves as a necessary prelude to his subtle and forceful comments on socialist realism, which deserve the most serious attention here as elsewhere. He states:

> "The concept of 'socialist realism', perfectly valid in itself, has frequently been abused and misapplied to academic historical and genre paintings and to novels and plays in fact based on propagandist idealisations. For this reason, as well as for certain others, the term 'socialist art' seems to me to be better. It clearly refers to an attitude—not style—and emphasises the socialist outlook, not the realist method. 'Critical realism' and, even more widely, bourgeois literature and art as a whole (that is to say, all great bourgeois literature and art) imply criticism of the surrounding social reality. 'Socialist realism' and, even more widely, socialist art and literature as a whole imply the artist's or writers' fundamental agreement with the aims of the working class and the emerging socialist world. The fact that the distinction is the result of a new attitude, not simply of new stylistic standards, was often obscured by the methods of administrative interference in the arts practised during Stalin's lifetime. After the Twentieth Congress, rigid adherence to a 'monolithic' Marxist theory of the arts was no longer obligatory, and although the conservative tendencies are still strong, a variety of different artistic concepts now confront each other within the fundamental framework of Marxism."

He concludes the chapter on *Art and Capitalism* by pointing out that a discussion about the new means of expression needed to depict new realities has begun in the socialist world which can no longer be halted.

> "Freed by the clash of opinion, art that is socialist in its content will—of this I am sure—become richer, bolder, more all-embracing in its themes and forms, its endeavours, and the variety of its movements, than any art of the past. Do not be discouraged by obstinacy and mistakes, checks and reverses. Bertolt Brecht's *In Praise of Dialectics* applies in this as in every other situation.
>
> If you're still living, never say never.
> What is certain isn't certain.
> Things will not stay as they are . . .
> and
> Never becomes Before The Day Is Out."

Content and Form

The next chapter, on *Content and Form*, is in some ways the best. Inevitably Fischer has to return to some of his previous themes so as to develop them in terms of content and form. Much careful study has gone to the making of this chapter, not only of Marxism, but (as seems implicit) of Hegel, Aristotle and Plato in the light of Marxism. The result is clarification of a general problem, as important as it is difficult to be precise about. Fischer keeps his balance admirably with but a few plunges into obscurity. As Caudwell did, Fischer manages to keep abreast of broadly significant developments in the sciences, and, more important, skilfully turns them to the advantage of our deeper appreciation of aesthetics. (He thus also makes us indirectly aware of what we are losing through the relative paucity of popular Marxist theoretical exposition of the sciences in this country).

It is to be hoped that scientists will comment upon Fischer's analogical excursions into modern crystallography in particular and his illuminating treatment of the search for balanced relationship between form and content, based upon the thought that crystals possess the most perfect form in all inorganic nature. He concludes:

> "Nature does not subordinate itself to the laws of mathematical vectors, but vice versa: vectors are an expression of natural relationships. What we call symmetries are precisely this: series of regular intervals, i.e. specific relationships between specific atoms. These symmetries apply to the world of crystals, not because mathematics would have it so, but because it is the natural property of atoms to form groups at certain intervals under certain conditions. Long before mathematics calculated all possible symmetries, there was nature which produced those symmetries out of the properties of atoms. It is not mathematics but nature which is primary."

Ornaments in art are said to be what crystals are in nature. They are also said to be (and I am not sure what is intended) a form of art in which only vectors—intervals of the same kind—are used. But whatever may be intended, it suggested to Fischer a surprising lapse into diffusionist theorising. Ornamental art, he says, was first developed by the Egyptians, who were also highly creative and original in the field of mathematics . . . "and this early ornamental art was so perfect that all later types of ornamentation can be traced back to ancient Egypt". Fischer needs more than the support of Sir Flinders Petrie to sustain this startling generalisation—but he offers no other. However, he quickly recovers, with the help of Goethe and Hegel, to define reality, acutely in the context of his arguement, as: "*a state of suspended tension between being and non-being, in which both being and non-being are unreal and only their incessant interaction, their becoming, is real.*" Form is thus the manifestation of the state of equilibrium attained at a given time, while the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inherent characteristics of content are movement and change. As a simplification, therefore, form might be defined as conservative, content as revolutionary.

Fischer considers living organisms to help him to explain how, by contrast, human society has risen above nature and evolved its own laws. In society, the form, structure, or organisation that has already been attained offers resistance to the new—and everywhere the new content bursts the confines of old forms and creates new ones. In the arts in the capitalist world, the tendency to overlook the content, with a corresponding over-emphasis on form as though it were paramount, has brought "formalism" into being. And this, he points out, "is not really a question of the means of artistic expression . . . it is a question of the deeper, more general problem of 'formalism' as a phenomenon typical of a social form no longer in keeping with the times, typical of the fact that a ruling class has outlived itself".

Subject, Content, Meaning

Having shown how the problem of content and form is not merely confined to the arts; and how the idea that form is primary and content secondary is a typical reaction of every ruling class when its position is threatened, Fischer goes on to consider how the question of content and form arises specifically in the arts, fully respecting that the arts have their own socially conditioned laws and problems. In this section of his argument he is able to establish useful distinctions between subject, content and meaning. As he says, the subject alone does not determine a particular form, but content and form, or meaning and form, are closely bound together in dialectical interaction:

> "A subject like 'harvest' can be treated as a charming idyll, as a conventional genre picture, as an inhuman ordeal or as the victory of man over nature: everything depends on the artist's view, on whether he speaks as an apologist of the ruling class, a sentimental Sunday tripper, a disgruntled peasant, or a revolutionary socialist."

In discussing how the meaning of a subject changes, Fischer observes that, in the arts of ancient Egypt, men at work were a constantly recurring subject; that it is to the eternal glory of Egyptian art that it did not only create monuments to the ruling class but also included amongst its subjects those who worked, the downtrodden and the humiliated. He then appears to assume that the theme of men at work does not recur until exemplified in medieval miniatures and in Renaissance art (Dürer, Grünewald, Riemenschneider and others). In fact, he actually states that: "In the arts of classical antiquity, work was not regarded as a worth while subject". This is not true of the literature—consider, for example, the content of some famous similes of *Iliad*, or the theme of the *Plutus* of Aristophanes—and needs to be modified in respect of other arts.

But the later treatment of the theme in European painting is persuasively outlined and leads to fruitful discussion of the problem of how to interpret a picture. There follows an analysis of style in relation to social history, of form and social experience, culminating in an admirable account of cave paintings of the Middle Stone Age, as examples of masterpieces of art produced by an extremely undeveloped society. This reaching back, this evocation of the high achievement of cave painting, helps Fischer to maintain that primitive magic lives on as aesthetic magic. He shows how, between the time of Alexander Pope and Baudelaire, the world and language of poetry was disrupted, revolutionised, charged with fresh energy, as the Romantic movement responded, in its images and sounds, to the impetus of social change, represented by the incursion of the popular ballad into the art of classical order.

For Fischer a high point of this new world and language of poetry was reached by Baudelaire in his great poem *Le Voyage*, which he analyses in detail, to conclude that Baudelaire's state of flux between passion and boredom, adventure and decay, reflects the very contradiction of the bourgeois era; that, in content, form and language, *Le Voyage* is the poem of a social turning point. It is compared with a passage of *The Communist Manifesto:* "Constant revolutionising of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from earlier ones. . . ."

As a literary man, Fischer is cautious in writing about form and content in music—"the most abstract and formal of all the arts". He welcomes correction and it is to be hoped that musical theorists will follow up his challenge: "A dialectical materialist cannot easily say what is to be regarded as the 'content' of music; above all he cannot define it with a general formula; he is forced to examine each work in many concrete ways and to concern himself in detail with the historical development of music, the changing functions of music as a whole, and those of individual musical forms. This work still remains to be done." Nevertheless, Fischer throws out what he disarmingly calls "a few hints" about the development of music which enable him to make a summary definition of formalism in music which is valuable in itself and also has bearing on other arts.

Excellent though the chapter on *Content and Form* is, it fails to deal with one important problem relevant to the whole discussion of this part of the book. This is the problem of nationalism in art. How are different art forms associated with different phases of bourgeois development? The novel, as I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have said, is not treated in depth and so could not have been analysed from this point of view. But how, for instance, do we account for the rise of opera in Italy, the symphony in Germany, the drama in England?

Loss and Discovery of Reality

The theme of the final chapter is *The Loss and Discovery of Reality*, the "loss of reality" being a concept first spoken of by the German Romantic, Ludwig Tieck. The industrialised, commercialised capitalist world has become an *outside world* of impenetrable material connexions and relationships, so that man, living in the midst of that world, is alienated from it and from himself. "Things have become too much for people, the means too much for the ends, the tools too much for their producers". Many gifted artists and writers in the capitalist world are aware of this loss of reality. A total image of the new reality, however, Fischer argues, cannot be realised without the dialectical philosophy of Marxism. Nevertheless, non-Marxist artists and writers are participating in the discovery of the world about us. On the other hand, the efforts of socialist literature and art to discover new social realities were temporarily inhibited by bureaucracy, and bureaucratic opposition to these efforts is still encountered from time to time. The decisive task of contemporary socialist literature and art, to represent new reality with new means of expression, is closely linked with the entry of millions of people into cultural life. So Fischer—too readily, I think, associating culture with literacy. Better to think in terms of recovering the genuine popular roots of culture almost destroyed by capitalist industrialisation and replaced by the commodities of "pulp" art and those various artistic opiates, propagated through mass media, in which, as Fischer says, the capitalist world has discovered rich possibilities of profit.

The socialist world sets out consciously to rescue the arts from such degradation. The arts are "taken seriously", but, says Fischer, this attitude has led to various mistakes and excesses, because the problem of mass participation in the arts is not easily solved. There are no short cuts. "The way from art to man—'putting art on intimate terms with mankind'—is not the shortest distance between a Party Secretary's office and an organisation."

Fischer raises crucial issues of this kind as he examines the contemporary situation under socialism and capitalism and some future perspectives, especially in his section on art and the masses, which really requires a book to itself. In the process, he makes valuable points which need to be elaborated and further discussed.

Art begins with primitive communism, generated by collective social life of a most rudimentary kind. It has passed, in its varied forms, through a long historical process of development. In Europe, this has resulted, after several centuries of capitalism, in the isolation, alienation, and often the extreme individualism of the artist. In a modern Communist society, when the lost unity of man will have been restored in social life, on the basis of a very high level of technical production, art will once more become collective, at a correspondingly high level of expression and communication. But this cannot happen spontaneously, by a process of automatic integration. The difficult business has to be tackled consciously as soon as the transitional socialist society comes into being. How can the artist in a new socialist society become a collective worker, not an isolated individual? Existing socialist countries have had to meet this problem with varying degrees of success.

Fischer might well have drawn more largely upon their experience. He could have examined the social position of the relatively highly paid artist or writer in socialist countries, with the attendant risk of isolation from the lives of ordinary people. He might, more generally, have drawn useful critical lessons from the development of technical urbanisation in Europe and the cultural consequences. In any case, when the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America do develop socialist art forms, they will do so with much greater independence of European historical conditions. They can be helped by the study of European experiences, under capitalism and socialism. But, in the long term, Europe will have at least as much to learn from them.

for A "NEW LOOK" AT CURRENT AFFAIRS
☆
for ALL WHO TRAVEL THE SOCIALIST ROAD
☆
for A POPULAR PRESENTATION OF MARXIST THEORY
☆
for KEEPING ABREAST OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
☆
FACTS ☆ FIGURES ☆ INFORMATION

COMMENT

A Communist Weekly Review

Sixteen Pages Price **9d.**

from CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1
or usual supplier

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Discussion contribution on:

What is Television?

Bert Baker

"THE immense possibilities of mechanical reproduction allow good books to be distributed on a mass scale, good pictures to be printed in large quantities, good works of music to be 'canned', and good films to be shown to millions of people.

"But on the other hand, the capitalist world has discovered rich possibilities of profit through the production of artistic opiates. The producer of these opiates starts with the assumption that most consumers are troglodytes whose barbarian instincts he must satisfy."

A pungent, apt observation from Ernst Fischer's book, *The Necessity of Art*, just published as a Pelican Original, eminently suitable for opening up a discussion of the aesthetics of television in Britain today.

By the time that the B.B.C. starts its second television channel this year, we will have experienced ten years of a parallel commercial and State television network. During those years the quantitative and technical advances have been enormous: over 12 million TV sets, with almost 99 per cent of the population within transmitting range; some 40 million viewers in a total population of just under 53 million.

They have also been years of obvious advances in production and presentation techniques, with today a quality of skill in all fields of work which is the envy of most other television systems in the world.

Content of Programmes

These are the tangibles which—as with the immense profit which has been made during the past decade by the television tycoons—are possible to estimate with some exactness. What, however, of the programme-content, which television is now bringing into our homes with almost the same facility as piped drinking water? There is, of course, plenty of criticism of programme-content, and much of it valid. One or two quotations, however, will help to characterise the general nature of the criticism.

Richard Hoggart, for example, who was involved in the Pilkington Committee and its scathing indictment of the "triviality" of television, has stated what he personally sees as the real danger:

> ". . . not that mass culture will be crude and raucous, full of sex and violence. The real danger is that a successful mass culture will be too damned nice a bland, muted, processed, institutionalised decency, a suburban limbo in which nothing ever happens and the grit has gone out of life."

A similar point has been made by Jacqueline Wheldon (married to the B.B.C.'s Huw Wheldon), who worked on the Nuffield Survey, *Television and the Child*. In an article in the television quarterly *Contrast*, in 1961, she expressed her alarm at the climate of values being projected by commercial television, a climate which she labelled "Masstopia". This, she said, contained a "concealed prejudice against the variety of human existence".

> It was ". . . against all the difficult decencies of birth, love, age and meaningful death; against the difficult slow decencies of real skills never seen . . . against the complexities of judgment, taste, goodness, endurance, and learned tolerance . . . against tunes that aren't jiggy, joys and laughs that don't come instantly, cures that don't work quickly. . . ."

Such an atmosphere, contended Mrs. Wheldon, prevented the world seen on our screens from bearing any meaningful or good or even valid relation to real people.

Another writer in *Contrast*, has taken the B.B.C. to task for the implication in its programme policies that:

> ". . . all Britain is divided into two classes—a Third-programme minority and a majority which has an insatiable appetite for light entertainment, gory but not full-blooded sensation and an insipid, filleted, deodorised and dehumanised, simplified and popular art".

The Viewers

These are some views of television. What does television think of its audience? Do those who operate it feel that we are getting the television we deserve? Some of them think we are getting *better* than we deserve. At a conference on mass media and education, Cecil King, boss of our biggest Press and periodical monopoly, which has interests in commercial television, let the following slip out, perhaps rashly:

> "In point of fact it is only the people who conduct newspapers and similar organisations who have any idea quite how indifferent, quite how stupid, quite how uninterested in education of any kind the great bulk of the British public are."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The head of Associated Television, Norman Collins (who has reputedly become a millionaire since he left the B.B.C. to campaign for commercial television) has said: "If one gave the public exactly what it wanted it would be a perfectly appalling service."

This admitted estimate of the viewers, their lack of intelligence and their passivity, undoubtedly affects also the levels of television advertising. Advocating television advertising in opposition to other media, George A. Cooper, director in charge of A.B.C.'s advertising sales, made the point some time ago in the *Financial Times* that: "The power of persuasion has always consisted more in appeal to the emotions than to the intellect". Television advertising, he suggested, was able to make really effective use of the former.

On the basis of such views from both sides of the small screen, television is today in a sorry mess. It means that all our television programmes are trivial, detached from life and reality, and that this situation is accepted by dull-witted viewers generally and exploited for profit by commercial television in particular.

A gloomy conclusion, indeed—*if it were accurate.*

There has been, in fact, a growing amount of positive, progressive, socially-conscious work appearing on our television screens.

Progressive Trends

Let us take drama. The watershed of British postwar drama is generally considered to be 1956, a year in which commercial television was still in its early infancy. Yet quite a number of our new young playwrights were slow off the mark in seeing the opportunities offered them by television (some of them adamantly refused to work in the medium), and television itself rejected many of *them.*

But in recent years we have seen performed on television plays by Alun Owen, David Mercer, Stuart Douglass, David Turner, to name only a few of our progressive playwrights who have established themselves in the medium, and Granada will soon be screening the plays of Arnold Wesker. Television has itself developed a number of dramatists, and the audiences for them, who only later turned their talents to the theatre—Alun Owen, Harold Pinter and Willis Hall come to mind.

In other areas of television we have witnessed the breakthrough of the young satirists with the B.B.C.'s TW3, and in the documentary field we have seen the work of such talented artists as Denis Mitchell.

Of particular significance has been John Berger's two series of half-hour programmes for Granada, which have been rightly described as "the most valuable example of the need for urgent exploration of the medium's possibilities."

Indeed, there is a salutary simplicity to the "difference" in Berger's use of television—his assumption that his working-class guests were articulate, that their observations on human experience were as relevant as anything he himself could say. Would that many others displayed such humility! Berger illustrated, in his own special way, the contention of Raymond Williams that "*the only practical use of communication is the sharing of experience,*"

This all-too limited glimpse of some of the positive elements in television content, will, I hope, serve to indicate that the medium has begun to introduce experiences—dramatised, interpreted, reflected—which are cogent to the issues in our society. And it has been done (though not every time) in a way which brings a new dimension to the perceptions and knowledge of the millions who view.

Here then are the potentially fruitful seeds of a new, progressive, *purposeful* content to television, and the question to be considered now—and marking a new stage in the development of the medium—is the character of the relationship between media form and intellectual content.

Specific Character of TV

To some extent this question was elevated from the realm of academic discussion by the Montreux television festival last April, when vociferous opposition was directed at the prize-winning *Julie and Carol at Carnegie Hall* the entry from the United States. The criticism arose from the widely-held view that the prize-winner was more "filmed theatre" than television. Then, at the Edinburgh Festival, *Contrast* organised a discussion on "What is a Television Film?"

What has to be decided eventually is whether television possesses specific characteristics, which not only separate it from other mass media but on which it can build its own, distinct art form.

Alternatively, it may be that television is no more than the most highly developed system yet for communicating the existing arts—music, literature, films, theatre, ballet, etc. It is good and timely that such questions are being put, but to me the answer is complex—and still incomplete.

One advantage, however, is that television—unlike radio, cinema, theatre or the Press (to all of whom it is related in form, content and organisation)—has virtually no traditions. An infant who tends to ape its older relatives, it is young enough, and should be adventurous enough, to search out its own aesthetics.

Its techniques, not hardened by age, are flexible enough for more experimental ventures than it it generally engages upon. Indeed, such programmes as TW3 and *The World of Gurney Slade* are but two instances of a breach in the pattern which the conformists of television would like to make permanent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Relations with Audience

If television is to become an art in its own right, it seems to me that the basis for it is to be found in the *unique* relationship between television and its audience, and in the nature of the audience itself. If we examine these, then, what are some of the identifiable, distinctive qualities which become apparent?

In 1946, the great Soviet film-maker Eisenstein considered the main aspect of television which he felt separated it from radio, theatre and film. He prophesied that:

> ". . . rapid as the glance of an eye or outburst of thought . . . (television) will be able to transmit to millions of listeners and viewers directly the *artistic* interpretation of the event *at the unrepeatable moment of its occurrence*, at the moment of the first and extremely exciting meeting with it."

Who would deny that this is so when, in the very near future, such an "unrepeatable moment" might well be a television transmission to millions of man's first landing on the Moon? And the "artistic interpretation" of that moment will be dependant on the skill of the director, cameramen, sound technicians, etc., involved in transmitting the historic event.

Artistic interpretation in television as a whole means much more than technical skill. It is the creative function which produces a purposeful selection of material, an active, sensible portrayal of life. It is the difference between compulsive television journalism and that which "never bites the memory", it is the difference between the "serious" or "solemn" and the "good" in television.

Less recognisable, however, is the fact that the quality of the "unrepeatable moment" is *not confined to events captured by the camera at the moment of happening*. This effect of "presence" permeates all of television, it is an element which is there whether the programme is a news transmission, a scripted documentary feature or a play. And it is a real factor, not an illusory one. The viewer, *because of the character of television*, believes, or rather *feels*, that he is seeing reality on the television screen.

In the Home

So the attitude that the viewer brings to television in this respect provides at least this one distinctive quality.

What other such qualities can be marshalled?

Take the fact that we read a newspaper, magazine or book according to our own interests and tastes, *buying* it and *bringing* it home. So also do we *go* to see a film or a play.

But once we have a set, television comes into our home itself. Therefore, while television is akin to the cinema, "going to the pictures" demands a number of conscious decisions and actions—which film to see, where to see it, when to see it, how much to pay for your seat.

Secondly, watching a film is a decidedly group activity, conducted in a mass atmosphere, which influences the response and degree of absorption by the audience. In general, however, the deliberation with which you *go* to a cinema, and your becoming part of fairly large audience when you get there, tends to increase the degree of attentiveness you give to the film.

Television, seen in the milieu of a private home and requiring the minimum of decisions preparatory to viewing, makes less demands on attentiveness. It has to compete with any number of alternatives—books to be read, chores to be done or visitors to be welcomed. Yet—and this seems to me to be important—at the same time, and contrariwise, television operates in conditions which, in essence, are much more conducive to *individual* attentiveness and absorption.

This aspect needs to be considered in the light of the nature of the television audience itself, about which there are several theories.

Some are concerned with the "largeness" of the audiences: millions of people being exposed for a short time only to a programme or play, with those who wish to communicate unable to interact with members of the audience on a face-to-face basis. This "transient" aspect of television has frequently been seen by progressive creative artists as a reason for not using the medium. But this is to deny any special characteristic to a television audience, and to equate it with those who go to the cinema or a football match.

The reality, however, is to be found in the *intimacy* of the place where television programmes are being received. On this it is worth quoting the well-known documentary film-maker John Grierson, whose *This Wonderful World* is the most popular programme on Scottish Television:

> ". . . the exciting thing about television audiences is that it is a far more varied phenomenon that we ever dreamt of in the cinema world. . . . What has been less obvious is the thought that in certain aspects the television audience is not really an audience at all, much less a public audience. This possibility has not been greatly grasped.

Referring to this "unique television relationship", Grierson goes on to say:

> "These two or three people gathered together may be thought of not only in their domestic unity but as separate individuals . . . it is possible to think that each is seeing and listening quite privately, *as when they read a book*" (My italics—B.B.).

So, the relationship between television and its audience is not (simply because it is a *large* audience *in numbers*), impersonal and fleeting—it is, in fact,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as personal and close as that which exists between author and reader.

Clearly, this distinctive "intimacy" imposes, or should impose, its own requirements on both picture and text in television.

Another theory about television audiences is that people do not look for "new experience" in television, but for a repetition and elaboration of their old experiences. Two suggestions are implicit in this theory. One provides a tailor-made excuse for the tendency of commercial television to repeat ad nauseam formulas which have been popular in the past, and to do so at peak viewing times. The other suggestion is that television has little or no influence in changing people's attitudes. This, too, is over-simplification.

Effects of Television

An oft-quoted vindication of this view is a study made during the 1959 General Election, in which it was found that political inclinations remained almost entirely unaffected by the televisual aspects of the political campaigning. The authors of this survey did, however, *also* come to the conclusion that the influence of television—its "drip impact"—would only be discernible over a much longer period than a three weeks' electoral campaign.

A number of investigations into the impact of television on children have shown that certain generalised attitudes can be formed. It is highly probable, for example, that the impact of television advertising and the quiz-shows for big prizes, is a factor in stimulating some children toward a more materialistic, more "competitive" attitude to life. In a study of the influence of television crime-drama on children and adolescents, carried out by the University of Melbourne's Department of Visual Aids, it was concluded that:

> "If there is some risk to children viewing this type of programme constantly, it would appear to lie . . . in the direction of the acquisition of certain relatively stereotyped and insensitive reactions, i.e., a decrease of sympathetic 'rapport' with one's fellows."

On the other hand, the influence of television, particularly on young people, is frequently being exaggerated out of all proportion.

The danger of this, as pointed out by the Communist Party in its evidence to the Pilkington Committee, is that it diverts the attention of society away from the real sources of social problems today —poverty, bad housing, overcrowding, lack of schools, poor educational and recreational facilities, etc.

In this regard, Robert Silvey, head of the B.B.C. Audience Research has admitted, significantly, that "the power of broadcasting to influence people's ideas, attitudes and values is at its greatest where there is bewilderment and emotional insecurity".

What does become clear from all this, however, is the fact that a television audience is not "passive" and "captive", but highly individualistic, bringing to its viewing its own highly varied experience and interpretation of life. And it does so in the process of an "intimate" relationship with television which is not to be found in any other mass medium, and with the feeling that what is being seen is happening at that precise moment of time.

So, it seems to me, picture, text, music—and viewer—comprise an inseparable unity. Recognition of this unity and the factors of which it is compounded is essential to any development of a distinct televisual art form.

The Real Enemy

Finally, one of the biggest obstacles facing those who wish for the creative advance of television today is contained in its own conception of the nature and motivation of its audiences.

And I would end this article—which has aimed more at posing questions rather than completely answering them—as I began, by quoting Ernst Fischer's observations on the "simple man".

For he asks: "Does he still exist, this much-praised 'simple' man, this ordinary, unsophisticated reader, listener, or gallery visitor? . . . Such people are becoming increasingly rare in our industrialised, town-dominated civilisation.

> "Even in the capitalist world with its commercial tendency to level our cultural differences, the differences are in fact infinitely greater than simplifiers allow."

Fischer also declares that: "What is alarming in the capitalist world is not 'formalism', not abstract painting or poems, not serial music or the anti-novel.

> "The real and terrible danger lies in the highly concrete, down-to-earth, 'realistic' if you will, productions of idiotic films and comics, commodities for the promotion of stupidity, viciousness and crime. War is not prepared by subtle works of art but by a very coarse diet indeed."

It is not until television dismisses the Frankenstein monster it has created—the "mass" audience of "simple" men—and recognises the nature of the relationship between itself and an audience made up of intelligent, discerning and complex individuals, that it will really clear the ground for creating a new, distinctive and progressive television art.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

free gift of Soviet postage stamps

with every subscription to any of these magazines

as regular readers of MARXISM TODAY know, most of these journals are published in both an English and a Russian edition: the annual subscription to the twin editions is the same as that for two years of the English edition straight from Moscow to your mailbox

SOVIET UNION

60 pages of colourful pictures and articles with a wide view of the vastly variegated life of the USSR

monthly 10s a year 16s for two years

SOVIET SPORTS

8-page supplement to SOVIET UNION, specialising in all aspects of sport

monthly 3s a year extra 6s extra for 2 yrs

CULTURE AND LIFE

illustrated magazine covering national and international cultural and scientific affairs

monthly 10s a year 16s for two years

NEW TIMES

international economics, politics and culture surveyed and analysed

weekly 14s a year 21s for two years

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

penetrating political comment on today's fast-changing world scene

monthly 14s a year 21s for two years

SOVIET LITERATURE

vehicle of new soviet writing and literary criticism. English edition only

monthly 12s 6d a year 20s for 2 yrs

CENTRAL BOOKS 37 Grays Inn Rd London WC1

please send me the following subscriptions and FREE GIFTS

	English edition 1 yr	English edition 2 yrs	English & Russian editions 1 yr
SOVIET UNION	☐	☐	☐
SOVIET UNION and SPORTS supplement	☐	☐	☐
CULTURE AND LIFE	☐	☐	☐

	English edition 1 yr	English edition 2 yrs	English & Russian editions 1 yr
NEW TIMES	☐	☐	☐
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS	☐	☐	☐
SOVIET LITERATURE	☐	☐	☐

I enclose £.....:.....s.....d.

name .....

address .....

MTD .....

Published by the Communist Party, 16 King Street, London, W.C.2, and printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.) Aldenham, Herts.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

December 1963

L. CORVALAN: *The Peaceful Way—a Form of Revolution*

S. ALVAREZ: *Concerning Revolutionary Situations*

H. CLAUDE: *Economic Aspects of the Paris-Bonn Axis*

Price 2s. 6d.

Order from Central Books, 37 Gray's Inn Road, London, W.C.1

REGISTER NOW!

for the

1964 COMMUNIST PARTY HOLIDAY SCHOOL

August 8-15, 1964

on

MARXISM AND THE PATH TO SOCIALISM

at

Lyme Hall, Disley, Cheshire

(Gateway to the Peak District)

Cost: 10 guineas each

(*It is regretted that children cannot be accepted*)

Lectures

Marxism and Reformism in the Labour Movement
World Problems of Advance to Socialism
Nationalism and Internationalism
The British Road to Socialism
Immediate Problems of a Labour Government
The Communist Party, the Party of Socialism

Also optional evening lectures, films, historical tours, socials.

BOOK EARLY

For further information and booking write to:

THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT COMMUNIST PARTY

16, King Street, London, W.C.2

WE DO NOT usually publish anything new over Christmas and the New Year, but have pleasure in announcing now a few of the books which will be appearing in the first half of this year.

The year 1964 sees the 400th anniversary of the birth of Shakespeare. In the early spring there will be published SHAKESPEARE IN A CHANGING WORLD, a volume of twelve essays edited by Arnold Kettle.

Also in preparation are: MARXISM AND LINGUISTIC PHILOSOPHY, by Maurice Cornforth; SELECTED WRITINGS OF DIDEROT, edited by Jonathan Kemp; WILLIAM MORRIS, THE MAN AND THE MYTH, by R. Page Arnot; MONOPOLY, FOOD AND FARMING, by Jack Dunman; and a new "Socialism Today" booklet, THE BRITISH ECONOMY, by William Mennell.

★

Brian Almond's recently published novel about Lancashire, GILD THE BRASS FARTHING, has won some very good reviews in the local and trade union press.

"I was reminded of the stark reality of 'Germinal'," said the *T.G.W.U. Record*. "It is one of the most absorbing novels I have read for a long time", said Tom Ponsonby in *New Dawn*. "He knows his Lancashire", said *The Foundry Worker*. And extensive notices in local papers said: "The author knows his cotton folks . . .", "an absorbing narrative . . .", "a fascinating story . . .", "uncommonly true . . .".

★

We have had some complaints about the price (21s.) of the new edition of John Eaton's POLITICAL ECONOMY, A MARXIST TEXTBOOK, bound in paper covers. We are very sorry we could not make it less expensive, in view of the actual printing costs. But in order to supply what may be thought better value for money, we are now binding some copies in hard covers, with a dust-jacket, for sale at 25s. This, we hope, will prove more satisfactory to those who want a more durable binding.

LAWRENCE & WISHART

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Collet's

Thirtieth Anniversary Catalogue

Containing over 400 titles in the English language will gladly be sent on request.

Collet's

1964 Travel List

is also available — an invaluable aid to planning your holidays in Eastern Europe, U.S.S.R. and China, from:

COLLET'S HOLDINGS LIMITED
44/45, Museum Street
London, W.C.1

five important new paperbacks containing selections from statements by ***N S Khrushchov***

THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKING-CLASS AND COMMUNIST MOVEMENT
128 pp

TO AVERT WAR, OUR PRIME TASK *192 pp*

SOCIALISM AND COMMUNISM *176 pp*

IMPERIALISM – ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE, ENEMY OF PEACE *125 pp*

THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT
96 pp

6d each—2s 6d the set—
postage 4d each or 1s 3d the set

Lenin on Peaceful Coexistence *256 pp 1s*

from your usual suppliers or from

CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Grays Inn Road London WC1

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED